



# Council

---

**Wednesday 6 April 2016**

**2.00 pm**

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

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

---

## COUNCIL

---

**Wednesday 6 April 2016, 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 Talib Hussain)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Julie Gledhill 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 Mohammad Maroof
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed	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 Garry Weatherall	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Aodan Marken 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 Chris Peace	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
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> Dianne Hurst 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 Zoe Sykes
				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](mailto: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](http://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  
6 APRIL 2016**

**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 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016 and the special meeting of the Council held on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2016 (Budget Meeting) 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. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE**

That this Council:-

- (a) recalls that central government has taken away around a half of its funding to the Council, resulting in the current Administration having to make savings of over £300m since the Conservative/Lib Dem coalition came to power in 2010;
- (b) further recalls comments by the former Liberal Democrat MP and Chief Secretary to the Treasury, the Rt. Hon. Sir Danny Alexander, that local government has “borne the brunt of deficit reduction” under the coalition government;
- (c) regrets that the current government are continuing the approach to local government that was established by the coalition, decimating funding for local government, making significant cuts to provision in many services inevitable;
- (d) understands that these government cuts have made it impossible for the Council to continue to provide the same level of services, which has meant tough decisions have had to be taken about which services to protect and which ones have had to be cut; and
- (e) notes that despite these challenges the current Administration has balanced the books each year it has controlled the Council, and believes that the current Administration has retained its ambition for the city in these difficult times and has got significant achievements, including:
  - (i) protected child safeguarding from budget cuts;
  - (ii) achieved the best record for apprenticeships among the Core Cities;
  - (iii) helped to deliver Europe’s first Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District;
  - (iv) established Sheffield Money as an alternative to exploitative payday lenders; and
  - (v) delivered the Streets Ahead project, which has resurfaced 350 miles of road and 600 miles of pavement.

## 8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR CATE MCDONALD

That this Council:-

- (a) expresses its dismay at the incompetence and unfairness of the Chancellor George Osborne's 2016/17 Budget, in particular the decision to cut £4.4bn from disability benefits which would have left 370,000 disabled people £3,500 a year worse off;
- (b) believes the decision to cut Personal Independence Payments for disabled people and those with chronic health problems to fund lower rates of Capital Gains Tax for the wealthiest is indicative of the Conservatives' warped priorities and shows 'compassionate conservatism' to be nothing more than empty rhetoric;
- (c) welcomes the Chancellor's u-turn on this decision, but believes he should apologise for the fear and worry his plans have caused many thousands of disabled people;
- (d) notes analysis from the Institute for Fiscal Studies which shows that over 80p in every £1 spent on raising thresholds and allowances in this budget will go to the top half of households and more than 30p will go to the UK's richest 10%, and is disappointed that the Government appear to be continuing the Conservative/Lib Dem coalition government's policy of balancing the budget on the backs of the poorest;
- (e) notes findings from The Centre for Welfare Reform that disabled people bore 29% of all cuts under the coalition government, despite accounting for just 8% of the population; and
- (f) recalls cuts implemented under the coalition government which impacted disproportionately on the most vulnerable in society, including:
  - (i) the bedroom tax - two thirds of the tenants hit by this are from households that contain someone who has a disability;
  - (ii) cutting social care by £3.5bn, leading to a situation in which two out of five disabled people in this country are now unable to eat, wash, dress or get out of the house due to underfunded services in their area;
  - (iii) cutting Remploy – a scheme that helped disabled people into work;
  - (iv) cutting Working Tax Credits for low-paid workers;
  - (v) overseeing a huge increase in punitive benefit sanctions; and

(vi) scrapping Council Tax Benefit.

**9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes the consultation currently taking place on the Private Hire Operator and Private Hire Vehicle Policy;
- (b) notes that Liberal Democrat Councillors have been contacted by hundreds of people within the taxi and private hire vehicle profession who have voiced their objections to these proposals;
- (c) believes that some of the suggested changes to the Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Policy will make the taxi profession unviable for many people;
- (d) notes in particular the proposal to change the age of vehicles able to register as private hire vehicles from under 5 years old to under 1 year old and the length of time a vehicle can remain licensed from 9 years to 7 years will make private hire vehicle drivers liable for huge unnecessary costs;
- (e) believes the Council should be taking other measures to tackle air pollution such as improving cycle links and public transport to tackle problems with air pollution rather than through an attack on taxi and private hire vehicle drivers; and
- (f) therefore calls on the Administration to immediately drop these proposals and go back to the drawing board.

**10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JAYNE DUNN**

That this Council:-

- (a) reiterates its opposition to the Government's damaging Housing and Planning Bill and is concerned the Bill will lead to a reduction in the number of social homes in Sheffield;
- (b) notes the Administration's support for 'Kill the Bill' – a national campaign opposing the Housing and Planning Bill, and a rally organised by Sheffield Trades Union Council and Sheffield Defend Council Housing, due to take place on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2016 outside Sheffield Town Hall; and
- (c) welcomes the Administration's commitment to increase the Council housing stock by 1,000 units over the next four years.

## **11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL**

That this Council:-

- (a) believes that:
  - (i) the health and safety of all construction workers is paramount; and
  - (ii) all workers should be fairly rewarded for their efforts;
- (b) therefore welcomes the current Administration's decision to adopt a Minimum Standards Construction Site Charter that clearly sets out the standards expected for construction sites and the employment rights of construction workers; and
- (c) looks forward to working with contractors to deliver the standards set out in the Charter.

## **12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS**

That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the news in the budget that small businesses will be exempt from paying business rates, which had been called for before the budget by Liberal Democrat leader, Tim Farron MP;
- (b) believes that small businesses are at the heart of every local economy and by taking them out of paying business rates, they will have more time and money to invest in growing their businesses and employing more local people;
- (c) however, is concerned with the impact this will have on local government finance, when retention of business rates replaces the Local Government Finance Settlement local government is set to lose nearly £2 billion in 2020;
- (d) notes the Chancellor made no commitment to making up the shortfall from business rates to councils in the future;
- (e) believes the tax rate relief for small businesses needs to be funded sustainably and there must be measures introduced to redistribute business rate income so areas with low business rates are not penalised; and
- (f) therefore, calls on the Administration to pull together a cross-party delegation to go and speak to the Treasury to voice our concerns about these potential hidden cuts to local government funding.



### 13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRIAN WEBSTER

That this Council:-

(a) notes that:

- (i) across the country, many public services have been outsourced to private sector providers - with the Financial Times reporting that local government outsourcing doubled in the last Parliament ([www.ft.com/content/244f0bd8-eccb-11e4-a81a-00144feab7de](http://www.ft.com/content/244f0bd8-eccb-11e4-a81a-00144feab7de));
- (ii) outsourcing has often failed to deliver the expected savings to the taxpayer, and failed to lead to better service provision - and that in-house provision can provide better value for money and more flexibility at a time of severe budget cuts, according to the Association for Public Service Excellence ([www.unison.org.uk/content/uploads/2013/06/On-line-Catalogue201223.pdf](http://www.unison.org.uk/content/uploads/2013/06/On-line-Catalogue201223.pdf)); and
- (iii) research by the independent campaign group, We Own It, shows that the public have very little trust in outsourcing companies, want to see more transparency and accountability over outsourcing contracts, and want public ownership to be the default for running services (<http://weownit.org.uk/privatisation/outsourcing>);

(b) believes that:

- (i) transparency is needed in the provision of public services, public service contracts and performance and financial data of providers should be available, and that freedom of information legislation should apply to private companies running public services;
- (ii) accountability is needed in the provision of public services, the public must be consulted about what they want from their services both in general and before any outsourcing or privatisation, and there should be a right to recall private providers of public services when they do a bad job; and
- (iii) people, not profit, need to be the priority in public service delivery, with public ownership the default (so a public interest case must be made for any outsourcing or privatisation), there should always be an in-house bid on the table if services are contracted out (or an explanation given why not), and social value must be a priority whenever contracts are awarded; and

(c) resolves to:

- (i) support the We Own It campaign 'Our Services Our Say' (<http://weownit.org.uk/public-solutions/our-services-our-say>); and
- (ii) provide a brief statement to We Own It explaining what the Council is doing in practice to work towards the principles of transparency, accountability and people before profit, for publication on the We Own It website.

#### **14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the medical profession takes an oath, "First do no harm", and believes that it is a pity that the Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP, and the Conservative Party don't take the same oath before they implement their policies in relation to the NHS;
- (b) also believes that Great Britain's beloved NHS, our most important institution, founded over sixty years ago, a real victory for the citizens of our country, is itself in need of emergency care;
- (c) further believes that our ageing population, the worrying numbers of people suffering chronic, long-term conditions, and the population explosion, are bringing the NHS closer to the abyss;
- (d) notes that the NHS needs an investment of at least £13 billion over the next five years, and believes that taxes must rise in order to meet this cost; that we need up to 20,000 more nurses, 3,000 more midwives, and 10,000 more GPs, and that in order to assist with this recruitment we could waive university tuition fees for new medical students who commit to working in Great Britain for a period of time; that taking care of taxpayers' money must be a priority, making sure it is spent on front line patient care; and that the long term practice of spending as much on consultants fees as we do on the purchase of life saving drugs must stop;
- (e) expresses frustration over the Coalition Government's wasted billions on a top-down reorganisation of the NHS, and over the drastic cuts to the social care budget, that now results in elderly people remaining in hospital longer than they need to;
- (f) regrets the real problem of so-called "health tourism", noting that, every year, the NHS spends approximately £2 billion treating those ineligible for free care, and that there is already a shortage of emergency medical consultants in our Accident and Emergency departments, and that patients who cannot get a GP appointment often turn up at A&E instead;

- (g) expresses concern over the spectre of the Transatlantic Trade Investment Partnership (TTIP), this proposed EU/USA free trade agreement that is being negotiated secretly, which may force us to put many of our public services up for sale to US companies, thereby allowing the possibility of large parts of the NHS being privatised, and believes that all political parties and all citizens of Great Britain must stand together as one in defiance of this potentially disastrous event;
- (h) recognises that, according to Age UK, 900,000 older people between the ages of 65 and 89 have social care needs that are not met, and notes that residential care, nursing care, home care, day care and equipment budgets have been cut and that these cuts impact on the NHS, with one million hospital bed days being lost every year when patients cannot be discharged because there is no after-care service available to them, and believes that we need a fully integrated health and social care service; and
- (i) believes that the way we look after the sick, the vulnerable and the elderly is a direct mark of how civilised and caring we are as a society, and that collecting the right amount of tax from multinational companies and wealthy individuals must be a priority, and our fixation with foreign wars and doomsday weapons must stop; and further believes that life is more important than death, and we need a policy of welfare not warfare.

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SIONED-MAIR RICHARDS**

That this Council:-

- (a) recognises and condemns the anti-social behaviour caused by illegal motorcyclists, including damage to woodland and parks, noise nuisance, and a lack of respect for other park users; and
- (b) welcomes the Council's action alongside the Police, as part of a city-wide group, to tackle this issue.

**16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MICK ROONEY**

That this Council:-

- (a) sends its congratulations to the Sheffield Steelers Ice Hockey Club who recently became the first team to win five Elite League titles; and
- (b) acknowledges the skill of the players and Paul Thompson, Head Coach and General Manager, and his coaching staff.

## **17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR STEVE AYRIS**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes there are around 36,000 privately rented properties in Sheffield, around 16% of our city's population, double the amount 10 years ago and almost as many are living in social housing;
- (b) notes that a lack of social housing properties, rising house prices and the difficulty in accessing mortgages mean that many people, particularly the young or vulnerable, have no choice but to live in private sector rental accommodation;
- (c) despite this growth in the sector, private sector housing remains 'Cinderella' to social housing in terms of Council time and investment, and currently the Council generally only provides a reactive service to problems in private sector housing in line with its statutory duties;
- (d) notes that there are many good landlords in Sheffield who provide excellent, affordable accommodation and a good service to their tenants;
- (e) believes that prevention is better than a cure and that we, as the city council, should find a way of working with landlords and using the skills and experience of the many good landlords in our city to drive up standards in the sector; and
- (f) therefore, calls on the Administration to work with the appropriate scrutiny committee to develop proposals and consult the public and landlords on what can be done to improve the standards of landlords and private sector housing in Sheffield.

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

That this Council:-

- (a) believes that part of what makes Sheffield so special and unique is our local independent businesses and the community spirit in supporting those businesses;
- (b) believes that by keeping wealth in our city, the Sheffield Pound will improve our local economy and in turn create more local jobs for local people;
- (c) believes that a 'Sheffield Pound', a 'community currency' that can be used as an alternative to Sterling within our city, would be a boost to our local economy by keeping money circulating in Sheffield;

- (d) notes other areas have launched similar schemes which have proven both successful and popular, such as the 'Bristol Pound' in 2012; and
- (e) calls on the Administration to work with community groups to explore the possibility of establishing the 'Sheffield Pound'.

**19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR AODAN MARKEN**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes with concern what this Council believes to be a troubling pattern by the current Government of reducing local decision-making power on important ethical and environmental issues;
- (b) believes that this pattern is illustrated by, among other things:-
  - (i) the issue of planning guidance in August 2015 stating that if local planning authorities do not approve or reject planning applications for fracking wells within 16 weeks, ministers can intervene;
  - (ii) plans announced in November 2015 to grant the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government the "power of intervention" over locally taken investment / divestment decisions with respect to the Local Government Pensions Scheme (LGPS), where those decisions are taken wholly or largely on ethical or environmental grounds;
  - (iii) proposals reported in the Daily Telegraph newspaper in January 2016 to "bring commercial shale production [fracking] within the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Planning regime", which would remove decisions on fracking-related planning applications from local authority control entirely; and
  - (iv) the publication of procurement guidance in February 2016 asserting that it is "inappropriate" for public bodies, including local authorities, to undertake procurement boycotts unless these are in line with nationally-directed foreign policy decisions;
- (c) believes that these steps by Government represent a concerted attack on local democracy and demonstrate that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's claimed pursuit of a "devolution revolution" is a sham, with the localisation or centralisation of powers used opportunistically to pursue the Government's ideological agenda;
- (d) believes that it is not only right but essential that the ethical and environmental concerns of local people and (where relevant)

pension scheme members be taken into account when decisions are taken that impact them, and that this is most effectively done when decisions are wherever possible taken locally;

- (e) calls upon the Administration to oppose the Government's efforts to remove locally-held powers over ethical and environmental decision-making in areas such as fracking, investment and procurement; and
- (f) directs officers to send copies of this motion to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change.

## **20. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAULINE ANDREWS**

That this Council:-

- (a) believes that the United Kingdom should vote to leave the European Union and that by leaving the EU, the UK would be safer, stronger, financially better off and free, and that only by leaving can we regain our national democracy, and further believes that the best people to govern Britain are the British people, and that British laws should be decided by our own democratically elected parliament;
- (b) recognises that the EU Membership Referendum is a once in a generation opportunity to take back our own country;
- (c) regrets that £17 billion a year is sent to the European Union from the British tax payer, and notes that this amount of money could build 750 new schools, 10 new state of the art hospitals and could cover the costs for a period of 25 years of employing 2,000 qualified nurses, 2,000 trained police officers, 1,500 GPs and 2,000 trained soldiers;
- (d) notes that the UK is the 5th largest trading nation in the world, and believes that we don't need to be in a political union in order to trade;
- (e) further notes that by being outside of the European Union, Britain would regain its power to negotiate its own trade deals;
- (f) believes the European Court of Human Rights has become a danger to British democracy and that the UK would be better off without it, allowing British judges to decide how our own laws are implemented;
- (g) believes that by being outside the European Union, Britain would have the power to choose who comes into the UK, whereas, whilst

members of the European Union, we have no say, and notes that the European Union has publicly stated that the UK has absolutely no chance of changing EU freedom of movement;

- (h) believes that a vast influx of unskilled labour does not benefit ordinary people in our country, as jobs are put at risk and wages undercut;
- (i) also believes that, with the huge numbers of migrants that have entered our country in the last decade, this puts tremendous pressure on our scarce resources, schools, housing, transport and jobs market;
- (j) notes that mass immigration can lead to access to free education, health care and benefits for many non-contributors;
- (k) regrets that while we are a part of the EU we also have to abide by the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights and cannot withdraw from this and the Court's demands;
- (l) notes that Britain, once a great sea-faring nation with the greatest trading seaborne empire the world has ever seen, is now reduced to importing fish to satisfy rising domestic demand, with the fish imported being caught in what was previously our fishing waters and subsidised with our own taxpayers' money;
- (m) believes that we can only stop this by leaving the EU and reclaim what is ours;
- (n) also believes that if we were out of the European Union we could make our own global trade deals, govern ourselves, control our borders and make massive savings; and
- (o) further believes that by being outside of the EU political union, the UK would thrive.



Chief Executive

Dated this 29 day of March 2016

**The next meeting of the Council will be its Annual General Meeting on 18 May 2016 at the Town Hall. The next ordinary meeting of the Council will be held on 8 June 2016 at the Town Hall.**

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## 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](mailto: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 3 February 2016, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

## PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR ( )

THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Julie Gledhill 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 Mohammad Maroof
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison	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 Garry Weatherall	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Aodan Marken Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Chris Peace	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> 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> Dianne Hurst 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 Zoe Sykes
				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 Talib Hussain) and Councillors Isobel Bowler, Rob Frost, Gill Furniss, Shaffaq Mohammed, Denise Reaney and Cliff Woodcraft.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Richard Crowther declared a personal interest in item number 9 on the Summons for this meeting (Notice of Motion Concerning the Steel Industry) as his father was employed by Forgemasters.

Councillor Jenny Armstrong declared a personal interest in item number 16 on the Summons for this meeting (Notice of Motion Concerning Student Maintenance Grants) as she was a student nurse.

Councillor Ray Satur declared a personal interest in relation to the subject of the Petition at item 4 (Petition calling on the Council to install crossing at the junction where Castle Street/Waingate and Haymarket join) on the grounds of his employment.

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2016 be approved as a true and accurate record.

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

**4.1 Petitions**

**4.1.1 Petition Objecting to Government Funding Cuts**

The Council received a petition containing 931 signatures objecting to Government funding cuts.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Alistair Tice. Mr Tice stated that he would urge the Council to adopt a Sheffield People's budget, with no cuts in 2016. He commented that it had been reported that 400 Council job losses were likely and given this background, it was important that the Council took the petition seriously. The petition, he said, had trade union support and had attracted a high number of signatures.

The petitioners were not calling on the Council to set an illegal budget, although he stated that the Council would be acting illegally if it was not able to carry out its statutory duties. The Chair of the Local Government Association had also referred

to the plight of local authorities. He asked the Council to explore the use of reserves and borrowing powers. The reserves earmarked to pay contractors, including AMEY and Veolia could be used now to plug the gap and campaign to regain the funding which had been lost. He said that he understood that the Council could potentially take the waste contract from Veolia and save money by running services itself.

Mr Tice suggested that the City Council took a stand and said that the Council would win the support of trades unions and local communities for such action and the launch of a mass campaign by like-minded local authorities.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. Councillor Curran stated that this matter had been discussed on previous occasions. He acknowledged that the Government austerity programme did hurt people. He assured the petitioners that, if the Council was able to set a budget which did not affect people it would do. However, the amount of funding which the Council received from the Government was decreasing. In 1992, the Government introduced legislation which required local authorities to set a balanced budget. It was very difficult to see how it was possible for the Council to set a no cuts budget, without it being illegal. Moreover, use of reserves and borrowing may also serve to store up problems for the future. No political party or local authority administration in the country had proposed a no cuts budget as it would be illegal and it was not proposed to do so in Sheffield.

#### 4.1.2 Petition Requesting a Loading Bay near Watan Curry House, Page Hall Road

The Council received a petition containing nine signatures, requesting a loading bay near the Watan Curry House, Page Hall Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mehboob Hussain, who stated that there was particular difficulty in loading to premises on Page Hall Road where there were double yellow lines in place and there was also a bus stop, with people susceptible to receiving parking fines when they were attempting to unload vehicles. It was requested that an loading bay was put in place at the site.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Councillor Fox said that he would make sure a meeting was arranged on site including with local councillors to look at the details of the situation as described by the petition.

#### 4.2 Public Questions

##### 4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Installation of Fire Doors

Richard Perks stated that he was a leaseholder and had been informed by the Council that he would have to have fire doors installed at his property. However, he said that no one had visited the property in relation to the matter. He stated that the cost to him of installing the door would be £1,500. In comparison, he had obtained an alternative quote to purchase the door himself and have it fitted,

which would cost only £500. He asserted that Kier would be making a profit of £1000 on this job. He also raised concerns about the overall profit which Kier made, and instances of overcharging by them.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, responded and stated that she would look into the amount that Mr Perks was being charged for the installation of a fire door and respond to him. She said that the Council was bringing services provided by Kier back in house.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning the Housing and Planning Bill and Welfare to Work Reform Bill

Mr A P Page asked whether the Cabinet Member for Housing or other Member of the Council would propose the following resolution:

- “
- a. Condemns the housing policies of the Tory Government in the Housing and Planning Bill and the Welfare to Work Reform Bill which will destroy council housing as we know it.
  - b. Resolves to:  
Oppose and resist these policies and support the national campaign to get these stopped alongside tenants, trade unions, councillors and MPs.
  - c. Oppose the imposition of a 1% reduction in council rents which will drain the housing service of £27 million per year needed for proper maintenance of the housing stock UNLESS this sum is reimbursed into the Housing Revenue Account.
  - d. Oppose the demolition of viable estates which are communities not just bricks and mortar.
  - e. Issue a public statement clearly expressing their opposition to the Tory government/s housing plans which undermine council housing.
  - f. Resists the implementation of these plans alongside the tenants national campaign to defend their right to a decent, secure, affordable home to rent.”

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that the Council had condemned the housing policies of the Government, such as the Bedroom Tax and had also supported campaigns opposing such policies which were unfair and had an adverse social and economic impact on people and communities. The Council was also opposed to the 1% reduction in rents. However, it was legislation which the Council had to implement and was included in the Housing Revenue Account item referred to Council from Cabinet, which would be considered at this meeting of the Council.

The Fairness Commission Annual Review commented on issues regarding housing and supported housing. As regards the potential demolition of estates,



Councillor Dore stated that the Administration would not be proposing a scheme to abolish 'sink' estates. It had implemented programmes to regenerate housing through Housing Market Renewal and the Decent Homes programme. The Council wished to pursue regeneration rather than demolition of housing. She also noted that there was a motion on the Council Summons regarding the Housing and Planning Bill. Councillor Dore affirmed that she would be glad to support a campaign which opposed the Bill, which she said was pernicious and draconian.

(Note: The Council noted a question received from Jules Alexandra which referred to a Council officer by name and would not be considered under the public questions item.)

#### 4.2.3 Public Question Concerning Closure of Government Offices

Kaltun Elmi asked if the opposition party would oppose the closure of government offices that are in Sheffield, to stop it moving to London.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council responded that by 'opposition' party she took that to mean the national opposition party in Westminster. She said that it was proposed that Department of Business, Innovation and Skills jobs would be moved to London. The Government would need to address the loss of employment in Sheffield and reconcile this with its stated commitment to the 'Northern Powerhouse' and associated investment, future economic growth, skills and relocation of businesses, which were needed in order to rebalance the economy. The first announcement of the closure of the Business, Innovation and Skills offices in Sheffield was made when the 90 day notice was served. She had written to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and had demanded a meeting with them and others including local MPs and unions, in order to understand the rationale behind the decision and to also make the case for the relocation of jobs from London to Sheffield.

Councillor Dore stated that she had not yet received a reply to her letter and if she did not hear from him, she would write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There was also an online petition which she would encourage people to sign. Louise Haigh MP had asked an urgent question in Parliament on this subject. A meeting with the PCS (Public and Commercial Services) Union had also been scheduled. The previous Coalition Government had also relocated Department for Work and Pensions jobs to Scotland and others had been relocated abroad. This latest decision was, she said, one which the Council would not accept.

#### 4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning the Stubbin Estate

Sylvana Mansell asked the following questions:

Would the Council be willing to allow the community of the Stubbin Estate to create its own future by shaping its own policies on a bottom-up basis?

Will the Council support the community if it is revealed that the agencies or individuals behave inappropriately and is there any objection to the publication of details as to the unacceptable behaviour?

Will the Council respect the wishes of the local people and give them prime importance above any imposed agencies?

Councillor Sioned Mair Richards, the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that the questions applied to her work on Neighbourhood issues relating to the Stubbin Estate. She suggested that she meet with the questioner regarding the issues she had raised.

#### 4.2.5 Public Questions Concerning Trees

Robert McBride asked why the Council had not adhered to the Aarhus Convention, which he said was a legally binding agreement, and carried out a proper and correct consultation process in relation to the proposed felling of trees?

Alan Robshaw asked why questions asked since the July Council meeting had not been answered. With regard to the Streets Ahead contract with AMEY, he asked why the Council said the contract cannot be changed, when Clauses 5.2 to 5.5 allow for change in service; the law; in highway standards; and in Council policy.

Colette Cameon stated that research showed that mental and physical health was improved by the presence of trees. She asked how this could be monitored and the effect on health and wellbeing could be measured of reducing this natural resource.

Michele Lazenby asked whether consideration had been given to the effect on property values where trees had been removed and potential for financial compensation.

Jon Johnson asked who was collating the evidence for the Independent Tree Panel and how the public could view it and make comments.

James Mountain stated that people had been told that there was no budget to retain the Elm tree on Chelsea Road. He asked as there had been no cost/benefit analysis undertaken on the street trees, how were costs being accurately assessed and did the Council acknowledge that large mature trees offer most in ecosystem services and had monetary value?

Helen McIlroy stated that AMEY claimed that all staff were NJUG (National Joint Utilities Group) trained and the 5 year tree management plan also claimed that there was compliance with NJUG guidance. She asked why on 15 January, machinery was used right up to trees at Winn Gardens within the NJUG protection zone and said there were photographs of this taking place. She also asked for the location of over 140 trees that it was claimed were retained using flexible paving.

Dr Deepra Shetty stated that the AMEY Operations Manager said that AMEY had an alternative specification that had not been made public and asked, if these solutions had been used on Snaithing Lane and in other places, why could they not be used city-wide?

Louise Wilcockson asked how people could submit evidence to the Independent Tree Panel as there were no contact details available. She stated that she had contacted the Director of Development Services in relation to this matter on 20 January. Louise Wilcockson also asked how people would know what would be put before the Panel and how many trees and streets will be considered at each Independent Tree Panel sitting. She said that more information was needed to allow this to be an open and democratic process.

The questions were referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor Terry Fox and responses would be given by Councillor Fox as part of his response to the petition concerning trees in Nether Edge which was presented later in the meeting.

#### 4.2.6 Public Questions Concerning Complaints Process

Marc Ewan stated that he had recently tried to make a complaint to the Council and found the process very difficult. He asked if the Council would be prepared to form a working group to examine and to scrutinise the complaints process.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, responded and stated that she was aware of the complaint that Mr Ewan had made regarding a recent meeting. Complaints, questions and queries were usually acknowledged and referred to a Council officer for a response. Members were advised that the matter to which Mr Ewan referred had been received by email and was being considered through the complaints process and Mr Ewan would receive a response to the matters he had raised.

#### 4.2.7 Public Questions Concerning Council Reserves and Budget

Roan James asked how much of the Council's reserves were to pay for Public Finance Initiative (PFI) contracts in Sheffield?

Carrie Hedderick stated that the scale of financial cuts to the Council was enormous and that the language which the Council used which termed these cuts as 'savings' was not the correct way of describing cuts which had been imposed by the Government. She asked whether Sheffield City Council had made moves to join with other local authorities to take the issue of financial cuts to local authority budgets up with the Government.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded that with regard to the Council's financial reserves, it was known that there was £28 million which the Council would have to pay for PFI contracts and the bulk of this was in Government PFI Credits which the Council was given.

Councillor Curran said that in terms of the scale of financial cuts, the Council had been clear about the level of financial cuts to its budget and that it was the Government's austerity agenda which was driving the cuts. It was not the Council's desire to make cuts, but it was the outcome of Government enforced austerity. No political group on the Council had proposed a no cuts budget and the

instruction from the national Leader of his political party was to set a balanced budget.

#### 4.2.8 Public Question Concerning Elected Members

Martin Brighton stated that an elected member had shown that the needs of the citizens come first and said that when a crisis occurred, at a weekend, and out of hours, that Cabinet Member selflessly put all to one side, pulled out the stops, and by the Monday remedial action had been put in place. He said that the Cabinet Member was Councillor Jayne Dunn. Mr Brighton asked: "could this Full Council please take this exemplar of good practice and use it as a template for how all elected members should serve their citizens?"

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded by thanking Mr Brighton for his compliment to Councillor Jayne Dunn. She said there were many occasions when City councillors went the extra mile and it was nice to show appreciation to them.

#### 4.2.9 Public Question Concerning Questions at Council

Martin Brighton asked the following questions:

What is the point, if: -

1. "When questions are asked in this chamber they are not properly answered, even when later asked to review the answers given?"
2. "When asked in this chamber to clarify the questions, the following emails are ignored?"
3. "Not one of the issues raised by the questions has ever been resolved?"
4. "Even when agreeing to meet with abused people, and making promises in a digitally recorded meeting, nothing followed?"
5. "Questions that should be answered by politicians, that do not come under [Freedom of Information Act] FoIA, are sent to the Fol department, who are unable to answer?"

Councillor Julie Dore stated that she believed that Members answered questions put to them as best they could. She said that if Mr Brighton was not satisfied, she believed that he would follow up the matter with Members or ask the question again.

With regards to requests under the Freedom of Information Act, a person bringing forward a question may distinguish whether or not the request was under the FOI Act and the recipient of the request may also determine that and pass the request to the appropriate department as a request under the Freedom of Information Act. In some cases, it was possible to gain more information by using the FOI process. Councillor Dore said that if a person felt that something should be treated as a FOI request but it had been answered as if it was a question instead, then they would need to say so.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that in relation to Mr Brighton's reference to abuse, it was clear that if he had any allegations of abuse, then he should contact her and provide details and she would request that officers investigate the matter.

4.2.10 Public Question Concerning Rutting

Martin Brighton stated that it was the annual rutting season and that it was city-wide, pernicious, showed disrespect for the community, was unsightly, and a safety issue. He asked that after all these years, could the Council adopt a policy and enforce a procedure to prevent rutting in public spaces?

Councillor Sioned Mair Richards stated that upon researching what was meant by the term "Rutting", she found that it was in fact a local reference to verges being driven over by vehicles, which resulted in the formation of ruts and cars getting bogged down on the verge surface. She stated that she, together with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor Terry Fox, would look at the problem of rutting and how it might be stopped, through for example the use of wooden bollards and she would respond to Mr Brighton on this matter.

4.2.11 Public Question Concerning Declarations of Interest

Martin Brighton asked if the Council would consider reviewing its Constitution and expanding the rules for Declarations of Interest.

He said that that: "The reason for this is because, upon investigation, it was found that there were many indirect associations or arm's-length involvement of elected members or elite but influential cadres that were not declared. What is being revealed is an entire community of inextricably entangled politicians and their self-serving puppets that are to all extents and purposes invisible to the electorate. It is asked that this review be urgent."

Councillor Julie Dore responded that, if Mr Brighton could identify where somebody has an interest which had not been declared, then he should bring this to the attention of the Council.

4.3 Petitions Requiring Debate

4.3.1 Petition Requiring Debate Calling on the Council to Install a Crossing at the Junction where Castle Street/Waingate and Haymarket Join

The Council received an electronic petition containing 7,833 signatures calling on the Council to install a crossing at the junction where Castle Street/Waingate and Haymarket joined. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the e-petition was as follows:-

*"I am writing this petition to ask Sheffield Council to install traffic lights at the junctions in the Sheffield city centre. The same spot where Summer Lee Seymour lost her life in a collision with a bus along with her boyfriend, who is currently fighting for his life.*

*As a bus driver myself, this has been an accident waiting to happen for a long time. It really saddened me to hear of Summer's passing and I think that in respect of Summer, and for her boyfriend, Sheffield needs to do this to prevent any other lives at risk.*

*15 year old Summer Seymour had her whole life ahead of her. I didn't know her personally and neither do I know the family or her partner, but this beautiful girl lost her life and I think it could have been prevented had there been traffic lights and a pedestrian crossing installed. It is really bad driving round the city centre, especially in this area. I've come across lots of near misses myself and it won't be the last time if something isn't done about this soon.*

*So please do this in respect of Summer Seymour and her boyfriend. Please sign and share. We don't want anymore tragic accidents, please act now."*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Melissa Hewitt who stated that the petition was requesting a crossing in honour and respect of Summer Seymour and to prevent the occurrence of another tragic accident. She was aware of the dangers of the junction and a crossing at that location was badly needed.

The petition had the support of Summer's family and it could make things safer in the area for everyone's benefit to try and prevent a similar tragedy happening again. She acknowledged there was a safe crossing by the KFC restaurant nearby but the area concerned was on a blind corner and was close to a taxi rank and also used frequently by buses. The installation of a crossing would slow down traffic in the area especially on the corner. She therefore hoped that the Council would agree to the installation of the crossing in memory of Summer and for the safety of the public.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport responded to the petition, following which the Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport spoke on the matter.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, thanked Ms. Hewitt and the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council and for raising the issue of the need for a crossing at the junction.

Councillor Fox commented that it was one of the hardest jobs for a Member and a Cabinet Member to be faced with such a horrific incident. He also wished Jake Ford well, who had also been seriously hurt in the incident. As a parent himself, Councillor Fox commented that he could not imagine what the family of Summer and Jake had been through.

As soon as was possible following the incident, Councillor Fox said he had been

to inspect the scene. Following the relocation of the market he would have expected footfall in the area to have decreased but that did not seem to be the case and there was still a high level of risk to people in the area.

Police investigations into the incident were still ongoing to which the Council was closely involved, noting that the speed limit in the area was 30mph and the condition and width of the carriageway had been inspected. Visibility had also been looked at and Councillor Tony Downing, Cabinet Adviser for Environment and Transport, had provided advice as a former bus driver.

The Council had a long list of traffic calming schemes which had been requested and affordability did have to be considered in the assessment of such schemes. Historical accident rates at that location were available and had shown that there had been 6 accidents in recent years.

Councillor Fox further commented that the Council had to take into consideration the police forensic investigation. The Coroner may put forward some recommendations which the Council would have to consider.

The Council was awaiting recommendations from different sources. When these had been received, they would be considered carefully and decisions would be made. There were some short term options available but the overall masterplan for the City needed to be kept in mind.

In conclusion, Councillor Fox thanked Ms. Hewitt and the petitioners for bringing the petition and sent his thoughts to the families of those involved.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Housing then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:-

The Council could look at changing the layout of the road and the safety issues in the area. Councillor Fox's comments that the evidence would be taken on board when reaching a decision were welcomed.

The junction concerned was a blind bend which was a blind bend by design. However, this style of junction created unnecessary danger and this should be looked at. The administration were supported in taking action that they thought was appropriate and it was hoped that progress could be made.

The death of a child or young person was especially sad and this incident could easily have resulted in two deaths and it was hoped that Jake Ford would make a speedy recovery. It was right that the petitioners were calling for something to be done. There had been many near misses in the area. Even when the market was there and there was a footbridge, this was often not used.

A change of priorities may improve safety in the area where vehicles could be made to give way at the end of Castle Street at the junction with Haymarket.

There was a need to do something both in the short term and the long term and

this area should not be forgotten and neglected. The problems were obvious but the solutions might not necessarily be so and it was accepted that officers needed to look at the area closely before a decision was made.

It was disappointing that a Police response had not been received prior to the Council meeting. The policy of prioritising road safety improvements based on accident statistics was supported and it was wrong to prioritise around schools and across the City, accident statistics should be the basis of such decisions.

Accident statistics showed that the issue was much improved compared to 20 years ago. The Council had limited resources and needed to ensure that it put money into areas where it would have the maximum impact.

It was important to see the Police report and it was agreed that the Police should be pressed to release that to establish what had caused the accident. The junction layout should be examined and it needed to be kept in mind that a lot of buses and taxis used the area.

The area concerned was a point at which buses gathered and was well used by pedestrians, including mothers with prams. If there was a proposal for a 20mph zone this needed to be supported by additional traffic calming measures and consideration should be given to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTe) also looking into the matter.

The reduction in accidents in recent years was heartening but one tragedy was one tragedy too many and the whole area needed examining by highway engineers.

Everyone was aware of the junction concerned and the safety issues associated with it. Despite the market moving location, the area still had places and shops to visit. The family could never recover from the loss of their daughter but if the conclusion was that the accident could have been avoided they would want to ensure that it never happened again.

The debate had highlighted the possible options available and it was important for the Cabinet Member to look at the short term options and also long term to consider who would continue to use the junction and think about what the best options were for all users.

The lead petitioner, Ms Hewitt, exercised a right of reply. She thanked all Members for listening and looked forward to seeing the outcome and the options presented for improving safety at the junction.

Councillor Terry Fox the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He further requested that Ms. Hewitt pass the thoughts of all Members of the Council onto the family of Summer Seymour at this difficult time. During the debate a response had been received from the Police who were in the last stages of drafting the report which would be sent to the Coroner. It was important that the Council did not pre-judge the outcome and they would keep the challenge up to ensure a scheme was



developed to improve safety in the area.

The outcome of the debate on the petition was as follows:-

<p>RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council:-</p> <p>(a) was deeply saddened to hear of the tragic fatal accident on Haymarket on 11 December;</p> <p>(b) requests officers to:-</p> <p>(i) review the lines and road markings in this area to see if there is any way to amend these to control speed; and</p> <p>(ii) follow the Early Action Team's recommendations and investigate whether effective improvements to this junction, such as road-narrowing, can be incorporated into the Grey to Green Scheme, which is being extended to the junction of Castle Street and Haymarket from next year; and</p> <p>(c) asks that the Cabinet Highways Committee consider the viability of the options available to improve the junction, taking into account the findings of the police report when it is published.</p>
---

4.3.2 Petition Requiring Debate Requesting the Council (acting as Trustees of Graves Park) to Protect the Park and Not Sell Cobnar Cottage

The Council received an electronic petition containing 12,942 supporters calling on the Council (acting as Trustees of Graves Park) to protect the Park and not sell Cobnar Cottage. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the e-petition was as follows:-

*"Cobnar Cottage in Graves Park is up for auction at the end of this month. If the Council (acting as trustees of the park) succeed in selling the cottage, it will break the covenants on Graves Park. This will put any of the rest of the park at risk of sale. It also puts at risk all the other covenants on property given to the people of Sheffield by J G Graves.*

*Graves Park does not belong to the Council, it belongs to the citizens of Sheffield.*

*In 2009 Sheffield City Council put all of the Graves Park covenants into one scheme, to protect all of the park and to stop any future disputes. By selling the cottage they are breaking their own agreements of just 6 years ago.*

*The latest proposed solution is that a stonemason has volunteered to live in the cottage and restore it to its former glory, using his skills. The Friends of Graves*

*Park have agreed to fund his work (he would give his labour for free and would only need funding for raw materials). The stonemason would also like to run training for young people and workshops for the public. The cottage would remain within the Graves Park trust and in public ownership. This is the perfect solution to the fate of the cottage. The Council, however, see no value in a stonemason working in Graves Park and have rejected this proposal. They are determined to sell the cottage.*

*The Council says the people of Sheffield do not care about Cobnar Cottage and support its sale.*

*Act now! Sign this petition! Write to your local Councillors! Write to the leader of the Council! Write to your MP! Help us to protect the covenants before it is too late!*

*Support us in protecting Graves Park!"*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Caroline Dewar who stated that 12,942 signatures to the petition had been received strongly objecting to the sale of Cobnar Cottage. It was protected by a Covenant and if the sale went ahead the Covenant would be broken and the Council would be held legally responsible.

Ms. Dewar further commented that the Charity Commission had stated that the decision to sell the Cottage was the responsibility of the Trustees. The debate presented the final opportunity for the Trustees to reverse the decision to sell the Cottage. There was, she said, a clear conflict of interest for the Trustees and the decision to sell the cottage was not acting in the best interests of the Graves Park Charity or the people of Sheffield. Trustees could not and should not pass on the responsibility for the decision to Council Officers and should not follow their misguided advice.

Ms. Dewar said that the Covenant stated that land in Part 1 of the Scheme must be maintained and this included Cobnar Cottage. The Cottage was very important to local people and the decision to sell was a clear message from the Trustees to the people of Sheffield. The sale must be reversed and should this not be the case, it was a clear example of democracy not working in Sheffield as the Trustees were not acting in the best interests of the people of Sheffield.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded to the petition, following which the Shadow Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods spoke on the matter.

Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, thanked Ms. Dewar and the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council and for raising the issue of the sale of Cobnar Cottage.

Councillor Richards further commented that she felt equally as passionately as the petitioners about Graves Park and she believed the sale of Cobnar Cottage at Auction in the previous week for a price of £152k was in the best interests of the

people of Sheffield.

The funds received from the sale would be invested entirely in Graves Park for the benefit of users of the Park. There were plans to improve toilet provision, play facilities, paths and running trails, which were all things that were needed.

There was no funding available to the Council at present to maintain the Park and maintenance works were funded through the taxpayer. As funding was reduced due to Government cuts, the resources available for maintenance were reduced.

Discussions on the proposals concerning Cobnar Cottage had taken place with the Friends of Graves Park for around 2 years and the Covenant allowed the Trustees to demolish the Cottage. The Friends had said they would agree to that. However, demolition was not felt to be in the best interests of the Park.

As previously stated, the sale allowed for improvements to the Park for the benefit of all users. The Trustees intended to continue to proceed with the sale of the Cottage. The matter had been to Scrutiny 3 times and Cabinet 3 times. Trustees had listened to the views of petitioners and the Friends of Graves Park and had explained the reason for the decision a number of times which was that the funds from the sale could be spent on much needed Capital projects for the benefit of the people of Sheffield.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:-

The land concerned had been gifted in 1925 to be retained as parkland. The City Council purchased another 1/3 of the land in the 1960's and in the 1990's sold off part of the park. It had been confirmed that the area referred to in the petition was Charitable Land.

The Council had brought everything together under one scheme to protect the park for ever so it was difficult to understand why the Cottage was now being sold off. It was proposed that local Councillors should be involved as Trustees as they had the local knowledge to ensure that the original intention of J.G Graves to protect the park was retained forever.

Graves Park had been gifted to the people of Sheffield and it was important that the Trustees acted in the people's best interests. The Cottage was run down and in need of repair. The issue of the sale had been scrutinised many times and the Charity Commission had not raised an objection.

There were no plans to dispose of parkland across the City. There would now be money available to spend on Graves Park with which the upgrading of the tennis courts should also be explored.

Local people were of the opinion that this was a first step and further sales were planned and other areas of the park were now at risk. The Council may realise £152k from the sale but a proper relationship with the Friends of Graves Park

would have presented an opportunity to transform Graves Park and would far outweigh the money gained from the sale.

The Cottage had been part of the park for centuries and should be maintained. The issue of how the park was governed as a Charity should be examined as it should be a local trusteeship with a role for backbench councillors and Cabinet acting as Trustees should then be freed from day to day responsibility for the park.

The wording of the petition suggested that all parks in the City were under threat which misrepresented the issue and may have caused people to sign when they were not aware of the true facts. An independent survey undertaken by Sheffield Hallam University had shown that people across the City thought that the sale of the Cottage and investment in the Park was a good idea.

The Friends of Graves Park had put forward a proposal to demolish the Cottage whereas the sale would preserve the overall setting. It was hoped that the Council and the Friends of Graves Park would work together for the future of Graves Park.

There was a perception that the Trustees had refused to listen to the people of Sheffield and had not looked at alternative options other than the sale of the Cottage. The Cottage had not been gifted to the Council but to the people of Sheffield and it did not lie outside of the park.

The disregard shown to petitioners by the administration was reprehensible and a matter of regret. The sale of the Cottage should have been postponed until the petition had been heard.

The issue of Cobnar Cottage was discussed at Cabinet in July 2013 following the submission of a report outlining potential options. Since that time the Council had continually maintained that if the Friends of Graves Park wished to present an affordable option this would be given consideration. The only option presented was demolition of the Cottage and this was not one that the Trustees felt was appropriate. The sale of the Cottage was therefore the only viable option and this allowed someone to live in the Cottage and money could be spent on improvements to the Park. Friends groups in the City were thanked and the City depended on their contribution to its parks.

The money raised from the sale was welcome, although it was also suggested that the Trustees were not entitled to sell the land. It was proposed that the issue be referred to scrutiny.

The City valued its parks and green spaces and it was recognised that people were passionate about them. With the Government cuts, the Council needed to find additional funding to invest in parks and money was needed to protect parks across the City and for the benefit of people in the City.

The lead petitioner, Ms. Dewar, exercised a right of reply. She stated that it was not true to say Graves Park was short of money. It was not a political issue and the Friends of Graves Park had met with Louise Haigh M.P. who had been sympathetic to their arguments. The Friends had spoken to a Stonemason who

was prepared to work for free in return for being able to live in the Cottage. This option was presented to the Council in October and November 2015.

Ms. Dewar further commented that the Cottage was protected by a Covenant. The Charity Commission and Covenants were also clear that money earned from any sale could not be spent on maintenance of the park and needed to be spent on Capital projects.

There needed to be a change in the Trustees of the Park to better represent local people. The Council did not own Graves Park, it belonged to the people of Sheffield. Selling Cobnar Cottage had broken a Covenant and should not have taken place.

Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She commented that it had been raised during the debate that Graves Park should be kept the same. She did not want the Park to be kept the same but instead she wished to see it improve which was why the decision had been taken.

The Cottage had never been a public amenity. It was private and would remain as such. Being sold and undergoing maintenance improvement work would allow residential ownership including the possibility of a family living there. The sale would not present a fundamental change to the Park for Park users.

Councillor Richards had received requests from local Ward Councillors to improve the tennis courts at the Park. This could now be a possibility with money received from the sale whereas previously there was no funding for this. Councillor Richards had listened carefully to what the Friends of Graves Park had proposed and believed that their proposals would not benefit the people of Sheffield.

The views expressed by the Friends of Graves Park had not persuaded the Trustees that they were taking the wrong course of action by selling the Cottage and the Charity Commission had confirmed that the Trustees had the right to sell.

The outcome of the debate on the petition was as follows:-

It was moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council not to sell Cobnar Cottage, but resolves not to depart from the current course of action to complete the sale of the Cottage and reinvest the proceeds in Graves Park

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor David Baker, as an amendment, that the issue be referred to the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee as it was considered that the decision to sell the Cottage was taken based on flawed information.

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

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

- For the amendment (20) - Councillors Richard Shaw, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Vickie Priestley Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.
- Against the amendment (53) - Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Dianne Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
- Abstained on the amendment (1) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

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

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition calling on the Council not to sell Cobnar Cottage, but resolves not to depart from the current course of action to complete the sale of the Cottage and reinvest the proceeds in Graves Park.
--

#### 4.3.3 Petition Objecting to the Felling of Trees in Nether Edge

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 6,500 signatures, objecting to the felling of trees in Nether Edge and requesting that, as an alternative to felling, sensitive engineering solutions be implemented in order to enable the long-term retention of trees in the Nether Edge area. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the petition was as follows:-

*“We, the undersigned, refute the assertion that the felling of trees in Netheredge, Sheffield, is necessary. Instead, we demand, and believe it imperative, that sensitive engineering solutions be adopted and implemented to enable the long-term retention of these trees.*

*Evidence indicates that such large trees contribute significantly to local climate regulation, filtration of atmospheric pollutants, sustainable urban drainage, biodiversity, ecology: health and wellbeing and amenity; through their beauty and our pleasure of its enjoyment, which enriches our lives.*

*So far between August 2012 and July 2015 2,019 trees have been felled across the city. The SCC argue that the trees are damaging the pavements and roads and are therefore are "dangerous and/or discriminatory to disabled people and those using pushchairs". We believe the damage is minor and does not significantly impair accessibility for disabled people, or the use of prams and pushchairs. It is our opinion that sensitive engineering solutions, such as pavement restructuring and localized remediation near trees, with kerb stones sculpted to accommodate root morphology, would represent a sustainable solution to perceived problems.*

*Loss of these trees would represent a significant loss of a valuable foraging resource for bees, bats, owls and many other insects and birds. Not to mention the emotional wellbeing of Sheffield's residents. Lines could be painted on the road to prevent parking under trees, thereby minimizing the risk of damage to vehicles, to a level firmly within the "broadly acceptable region" of tolerability.*

*SCC and Amey have pledged to plant small ornamental trees to "replace" the mature trees. These are not a replacement. Sapling trees cannot provide the same that mature trees can its impossible. Some of these trees are over 100 years old. It is ignorant to suggest that it is possible to just "replace" them.*

*Sub-veteran, mature trees represent our cultural heritage and are irreplaceable. We demand that alternative, sensitive engineering solutions be implemented as an alternative to felling.*

*Much of Netheredge is deemed a conservation area, these trees are an invaluable part of Sheffield heritage and cannot be allowed to be destroyed.”*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Carly Mountain who stated that the petitioners wished for the matter to be considered by a Council Scrutiny Committee. Nether Edge was an area which was rich in trees and it was also a Conservation Area. The Council's website made reference to the importance of trees in policy making. Mature large canopy trees had the most significant impact on air quality and trees had an effect on ecosystem services. Reference was also made to the call for investment in flood defences for Sheffield and to the contribution that trees might make to reducing flood risk. She said that a cost benefit analysis of highways trees was required and which should form part of the strategy regarding trees, which was awaited.

The contract with AMEY should have incorporated the issue of engineering solutions and trees might be maintained where alternative solutions and kerb specifications were used. She referred to the availability of financial resources, which she stated could be made available if the Council wished. The loss of up to fifty percent of street trees would she said change the face of the City and she asked whether the Streets Ahead project was sustainable. Saplings could still be planted, without felling existing trees. It was felt that the Aarhus Convention had not been applied with regard to the preparation of plans for the environment, and errors had been made with regard to tree surveys.

It was not known how the Independent Tree Panel could be contacted and there were concerns with regard to consultation relating to the potential felling of trees. The petitioners requested an Environmental Impact Assessment of the cumulative effect of felling high trees under the Streets Ahead project.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport responded to the petition.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, thanked the petitioners and campaigners. He stated that the Streets Ahead project was something which had the support of the silent majority of people who asked the Council to rid Sheffield of pot holes, improve street lighting and pavements and undertake management of highways trees. In an independent report during 2007, 75 percent of street trees were assessed as being mature or over-mature with potentially catastrophic decline in the health and safety of street trees if a programme of replacement was not undertaken. The Streets Ahead contract was informed by this survey. AMEY had a five year tree strategy within the contract. Information which had been part of a confidential document had now been released as public information. Councillor Fox said that the policy and procedures which were in place were up for people to challenge if they wished. Removing trees was ,he said, a last resort.

With regard to the Independent Tree Panel, Councillor Fox said that he was waiting to be informed about the detail of how people could contribute to it. Guidance was awaited as to how the Panel would receive evidence. He said that all sides in the issue had their own opinions. The Council was surveying every household on streets which were affected by the potential felling of a tree, which was considered to be above and beyond action required in other disciplines, such as planning applications. There was currently a process of carrying out surveys of 80 streets. There were approximately 100 trees that could not be worked on, 200 trees requiring significant engineering solutions and 1000 affecting kerbs. The cost to carry out the solutions required to retain those street trees would be £14.7 million and this would require an increase in Council Tax of 8.2 percent. 5,136 households had been sent surveys and 13 percent of those households had responded. The Independent Tree Panel had called-in the streets that they wished to examine and 37 streets had been released back to AMEY.

Councillor Fox stated that people wished for the Streets Ahead programme to move forward for the benefit of their communities.



The Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:

The Council was not listening and although credit was given for establishing the Tree Forum and an Independent Tree Panel, it was yet to be seen what this would achieve. The consultation in respect of highway trees was flawed and the felling of healthy highway trees was indefensible. A strategy would enable the weighing up of costs and benefits. Greater flexibility was needed concerning standards relating to pavement construction.

The Council said had that it would listen with regard to the issue of highway trees and Tree Forum meetings had taken place and meetings had been held with individual groups. 80 streets had been surveyed and to date, 2613 trees had been retained. 42 streets had been referred to the Independent Tree Panel and consultation was being undertaken as to the replacement of 231 trees. It was apparent that there was a silent majority of people saying that they wanted to City's roads to be upgraded and, without the Streets Ahead programme the Council would not be able to protect trees. Replacement of trees at this point in time would mean that the problem was not passed on to future generations. Many of the existing street trees were not suitable for the highway and some action was required. There were financial implications of delay to the programme and the Streets Ahead programme was something which had cross party support of the Council.

People were waiting for a strategy for highway trees, which had been promised in July 2015. The Independent Panel would not meet in public and surveys were not sent to households when trees were categorised as dead, diseased or dying. The recommendations of the Independent Panel would need to have some weight, although any solutions proposed would need to be examined to see whether these were affordable and there was no funding earmarked for the Panel. Comment was made regarding the potential to renegotiate the Streets Ahead contract.

There were differences of opinion regarding street trees. Some people wished for trees to be replaced and there was also a fear of people tripping and falling on uneven pavements. Falls affected the lives of older people in particular and uneven pavements may contribute to the occurrence of falls. It was important to have pavements with even surfaces and in considering alternative solutions to retain trees, some level of proportionality need to be applied. The Council would have to decide the extent to which it should fund particular items. The Streets Ahead programme was popular and it was helpful that the Forum and Independent Panel had been established.

The issues were concerning the operation of the PFI contract, rather than its aims. The Council had the final say concerning which trees were retained and which were felled. With sympathetic solutions, a number of trees could be saved. The Streets Ahead programme had the potential of improving the City's roads and pavements. The Independent Tree Panel needed to be open and it was understood that the Panel would visit sites on which trees were located, rather than undertaking only a paper based exercise.

Sheffield had the largest number of trees per head of population and trees had been protected. The Air Quality Action Plan also recognised the importance of trees. It was part of the Streets Ahead contract that every tree that was removed would be replaced and historical gaps in trees would be filled under the contract. The planting season was from October to March and trees needed to be replaced within a timescale. The Council was not an organisation which did not care about trees, but it need to make sure that healthy trees would be there in the future.

The petitioners were thanked for bringing deficiencies in the Council policy to its attention. The evidence presented by the petitioners could be used to inform the Council strategy regarding highways trees. There should be scrutiny of the issues raised and of the Streets Ahead contract.

A document produced in 2009 relating to the highways contract also referred to the replacement of highways trees. The City had some four million trees and 36,000 highways trees.

Where a community was saying that it wished to retain trees, then this matter should be looked at more closely. There was also cost associated with felling and replacing trees.

The lead petitioner, Carly Mountain exercised a right of reply. She stated that mature and over mature trees was a way of classifying trees and not an indication of a rate of decline. She said there was capacity to change the Highways contract and asked for the Council to be as open to retaining as many trees as possible and take into account sound evidence and not vested interest. Alternative solutions were required, such as those which had been used to retain trees in some places, including Snaithing Lane, and these solutions should also be employed elsewhere, for other trees.

She stated that saplings had a high rate of failure and requested that an Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out and that the Council ceased the felling of highways trees until consultation had taken place. The public was not able to contribute to the Independent Tree Panel but City Council officers and representatives of AMEY were present at the first meeting of the Panel. The Council was requested to vote on a moratorium.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He stated in relation to the Elm Tree on Chelsea Road that the Council was working closely with the Butterfly Association. When the Council obtained information, it would be made available in the public domain. On the matter of putting in place a moratorium on further work to highways trees, it was not only the Council and AMEY that had to be considered. The Department for Transport, banks and the Government were also part of the picture. There was cost associated with not meeting milestones within the contract and of standing down AMEY employees. The Council could potentially begin negotiations to get out of the contract with AMEY but there would be a cost and other matters to consider, including Government credits.

It was considered that the Council had gone beyond what might be expected as regards consultation in writing to each household in roads potentially affected by the proposed felling of a tree. The Independent Panel was independent and would tell the Council what they wanted and would reach a balanced decision. Page 12 of the Streets Ahead Five Year Tree Management Strategy stated that other engineering solutions were outside of the scope of the Streets Ahead contract. It was the right approach to continue with the Streets Ahead programme.

At the conclusion of the debate it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:-

- (a) is working towards a strategy to maintain and replace the city's street tree stock to maintain our green status;
- (b) notes that the trees that are now being replaced have been subject to consultation surveys with local residents and trees are only being replaced where the majority of local residents have indicated support for the proposals;
- (c) notes that where residents have objected to the proposals they have been referred to the independent tree panel which will provide advice to the Council;
- (d) commits to being open and transparent with the Sheffield public ensuring all relevant information is available in the public domain; and
- (e) is committed to delivering the Streets Ahead programme which is improving Sheffield's highway network for future generations.

It was then moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an alternative proposal to that set out above that this Council refers the petition objecting to the felling of trees in Nether Edge to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee with particular regard to the operation of the Independent Tree Panel and consultation in this case.

On being put to the vote, the alternative proposal was negatived.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is working towards a strategy to maintain and replace the city's street tree stock to maintain our green status;
- (b) notes that the trees that are now being replaced have been subject to consultation surveys with local residents and trees are only being replaced where the majority of local residents have indicated support for the proposals;
- (c) notes that where residents have objected to the proposals they have been

- referred to the independent tree panel which will provide advice to the Council;
- (d) commits to being open and transparent with the Sheffield public ensuring all relevant information is available in the public domain; and
- (e) is committed to delivering the Streets Ahead programme which is improving Sheffield's highway network for future generations.

#### 4.4 Petitions

##### Petition Requesting Improvements to Pedestrian and Cycling Routes between Chesterfield Road and Abbeydale Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 75 signatures, requesting improvements to pedestrian and cycling routes between Chesterfield Road and Abbeydale Road.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and Councillor Fox stated that he would make contact with the lead petitioner.

### **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).

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) reported that Councillor Colin Ross would receive written responses to questions which he had submitted concerning the Department of Business Innovation and Skills and Council Information Technology but which would not be permitted to be asked as urgent business.)

#### 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 Peter Rippon, that approval be given to the following changes in the membership of Committees, etc:

1. the removal of Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to create a vacancy on the Admissions Committee; and
2. that Councillor Mick Rooney replaces Councillor Anne Murphy on the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

**7. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN, HRA BUDGET AND RENT INCREASE 2016/17**

It was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the following recommendations of the Cabinet made at its meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2016 in relation to a joint report of the Executive Directors, Communities and Place and Interim Executive Director, Resources and concerning the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan, HRA Budget and Rent increase 2016/17 be approved:-

**“RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 3rd February, 2016 that :-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix A of the report is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix B of the report is approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including Temporary Accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2016 in line with the requirements of the anticipated Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) rents for garages and garage sites remain frozen at 2015/16 levels and not increased from April 2016;
- (e) community heating charges are not increased from April 2016;
- (f) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods to amend the burglar alarm charge in 2016/17 in line with the costs

incurred under the new contract, and that, until the contract is in place and the charges are known, the burglar alarm charge remains unchanged;

- (g) the Sheltered Housing service charge which was amended in November 2015 is not increased from April 2016;
- (h) charges for furnished accommodation are not increased from April 2016;
- (i) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current Government guidelines; and
- (j) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Cabinet Member for Housing, to amend rent levels for 2016/17 in the event that the statutory requirements at the relevant time are different to those anticipated.”

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker as an amendment that the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2016, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan, HRA Budget and Rent Increase 2016/17, be approved with the addition of a new paragraph (k) as follows:-

- (k) calls on the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance to report back to Council with details of any variations made to rent and any other charges contained within this report.

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

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

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2016:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix A to the report now submitted be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix B of the report be approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including Temporary Accommodation, be reduced by 1% from April 2016 in line with the requirements of the

- anticipated Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) rents for garages and garage sites remain frozen at 2015/16 levels and be not increased from April 2016;
  - (e) community heating charges be not increased from April 2016;
  - (f) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods to amend the burglar alarm charge in 2016/17 in line with the costs incurred under the new contract, and that, until the contract is in place and the charges are known, the burglar alarm charge remains unchanged;
  - (g) the Sheltered Housing service charge which was amended in November 2015 be not increased from April 2016;
  - (h) charges for furnished accommodation be not increased from April 2016;
  - (i) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current Government guidelines; and
  - (j) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Cabinet Member for Housing, to amend rent levels for 2016/17 in the event that the statutory requirements at the relevant time are different to those anticipated.

## **8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAUL WOOD**

### **Housing**

It was moved by Councillor Paul Wood, seconded by Councillor Karen McGowan, that this Council:-

- (a) believes the Government's Housing and Planning Bill will lead to a reduction in the number of homes available at genuinely affordable rents at a time when Sheffield needs more;
- (b) deplores the decisions of the current Government and the previous Coalition Government to cut grant funding for new social housing;
- (c) opposes:-
  - (i) the Government's decision to allow private consultants to process and potentially determine planning applications, and believes locally elected representatives are the most suitable people to deal with

this; and

- (ii) the watering down of Section 106 and the broadening of the definition of 'affordable homes' to include Starter Homes, and is concerned that these changes are likely to produce fewer new homes at genuinely affordable rents in Sheffield;
- (d) believes:-
- (i) children of tenants have rights and that the ending of home security for people upon the death of a parent is both ethically and morally unfair;
  - (ii) limiting councils to giving tenancies of between 2 and 5 years maximum is unfair on tenants and detrimental to developing strong, safe and cohesive communities and a stable schooling environment for young people;
  - (iii) believes the Right to Buy discounts for housing association tenants funded by the sale of high-value council housing is effectively a levy on the Housing Revenue Account and is detrimental to the housing needs of the City; and
  - (iv) a couple earning £15,000 each should not be the target of re-assessment for higher market rents; and
- (e) welcomes:-
- (i) the current Administration's commitment to increase Sheffield's council housing stock by 1,000 units; and
  - (ii) the news that more than 100 new homes are to be built in the Manor area on brownfield land owned by Sheffield City Council and that more than 150 jobs will be created during construction.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:

1. the deletion of the words "and the previous Coalition Government" from paragraph (b); and
2. the addition at the end of paragraph (e)(ii) of the words "thanks to the establishment of the Sheffield Housing Company by the previous Administration".

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

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



1. the addition of a new paragraph (d)(v) as follows:-
  - (v) that introducing a 1% enforced reduction to social housing rent this year will serve to reduce the Government's benefits bill at the cost of money for new housing stock and repairs, and believes that this is fuelled by an ideological commitment to austerity that means the poorest continue to suffer for the benefit of the wealthiest;
2. the addition at the end of paragraph (e)(i) of the words "notes that this will still be a net loss of stock since 2010/11".

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

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor Paul Wood, the original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes the Government's Housing and Planning Bill will lead to a reduction in the number of homes available at genuinely affordable rents at a time when Sheffield needs more;
- (b) deplores the decisions of the current Government and the previous Coalition Government to cut grant funding for new social housing;
- (c) opposes:-
  - (i) the Government's decision to allow private consultants to process and potentially determine planning applications, and believes locally elected representatives are the most suitable people to deal with this; and
  - (ii) the watering down of Section 106 and the broadening of the definition of 'affordable homes' to include Starter Homes, and is concerned that these changes are likely to produce fewer new homes at genuinely affordable rents in Sheffield;
- (d) believes:-
  - (i) children of tenants have rights and that the ending of home security for people upon the death of a parent is both ethically and morally unfair;
  - (ii) limiting councils to giving tenancies of between 2 and 5 years maximum is unfair on tenants and detrimental to developing strong, safe and cohesive communities and a stable schooling environment for young people;
  - (iii) believes the Right to Buy discounts for housing association tenants funded by the sale of high-value council housing is effectively a levy

- on the Housing Revenue Account and is detrimental to the housing needs of the City;
- (iv) a couple earning £15,000 each should not be the target of re-assessment for higher market rents; and
  - (v) that introducing a 1% enforced reduction to social housing rent this year will serve to reduce the Government's benefits bill at the cost of money for new housing stock and repairs, and believes that this is fuelled by an ideological commitment to austerity that means the poorest continue to suffer for the benefit of the wealthiest; and
- (e) welcomes:-
- (i) the current Administration's commitment to increase Sheffield's council housing stock by 1,000 units, but notes that this will still be a net loss of stock since 2010/11; and
  - (ii) the news that more than 100 new homes are to be built in the Manor area on brownfield land owned by Sheffield City Council and that more than 150 jobs will be created during construction.

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (e) and against Paragraph (b) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE**

### **Steel Industry**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Chris Peace, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that Sheffield has an international reputation for steel making, and that steel remains a crucial part of the City's economy;
- (b) reiterates the motion passed in November calling on the Government to take action to support the steel industry;
- (c) believes that the Government's response to the job losses around the country have been completely inadequate and believes that the Secretary of State must urgently reconsider his approach;
- (d) deeply regrets the news announced earlier this month that Sheffield Forgemasters is to cut up to 100 jobs and extends full sympathy to everyone affected;

- (e) welcomes action taken by the present Administration to work at a city region level to try to extend the support packages that have been put together for Tata steel workers to anyone affected by job losses at Forgemasters and to do everything it can to put in place support to get people who are facing redundancy back to work;
- (f) reaffirms that Forgemasters is a world class company but needs urgent support and a level playing field with its international competitors; and
- (g) supports the Save Our Steel Campaign and calls on the Government to:-
  - (i) provide support for a business rate cut for the steel industry;
  - (ii) give the steel industry a break from green taxes and high energy bills;
  - (iii) take urgent action to stop the dumping of cheap Chinese steel;
  - (iv) make a commitment to use British steel for all major infrastructure and construction projects; and
  - (v) look to use British-made steel in all Government backed contracts.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted for Paragraphs (a) to (f) and abstained on Paragraph (g) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER**

### **Tinsley Recreational Ground**

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that building has begun of the new Tinsley School on Tinsley Recreational Ground;
- (b) notes that this was the only publicly accessible green space in the Tinsley area and was a part of our city's heritage as the park that Gordon Banks, England's 1966 World Cup winning team goalkeeper played on as a child;
- (c) notes that there were alternative sites and options which could have been considered but believes the Administration refused to listen to public opinion;
- (d) believes that our city's green reputation and treasured open spaces are not safe in the hands of our current Administration;

- (e) notes that last January, Ochre Dike Playing Fields, Waterthorpe was designated as a 'Fields in Trust' protected site to allow it to be further protected and managed as a public park and playing field in perpetuity; and
- (f) therefore calls on the Administration to:-
  - (i) award the remainder of Tinsley Recreational Ground 'Fields in Trust' status to protect this community asset from this current Administration and in perpetuity; and
  - (ii) resolve that not one blade of grass of designated public open space or park land in Sheffield will be sold off or developed further.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Mary Lea, 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) recalls that the decision to amalgamate Tinsley Nursery Infant and Junior schools to create Tinsley Meadows Primary School was agreed by Cabinet on 16th April 2014 and planning permission was granted in July 2015, and is surprised that if the main opposition group have genuine concerns they have not raised them until now;
- (b) believes that it is imperative that the school is moved away from the motorway in order to alleviate noise and air pollution issues and the overwhelming evidence concerning air quality and children's health development;
- (c) recalls that none of the other options to relocate the school were viable and the decision facing the Administration was to leave the school where it was with the danger that presented to the health of local children or relocate it to the chosen site, and believes that the main opposition group should check their facts before making misleading assertions;
- (d) recognises the importance of protecting the local green space and notes that all efforts were made to keep the development to a quarter of the green space and commits to protecting the rest of the site from development;
- (e) notes that the school will continue to work with the community and offer community activity and support on the site, alongside providing a great inclusive education for children in Tinsley, in line with our corporate mission to make every school a great school;
- (f) commits to work with local young people to ensure they get best use of the pavilion, noting that the Administration has given Tinsley Forum a grant for the provision of activities for young people; and

- (g) recalls that Ochre Dike Playing Fields, Waterthorpe was protected due to plans to develop whilst the previous Administration was in control and is therefore astounded at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group.

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) recalls that the decision to amalgamate Tinsley Nursery Infant and Junior schools to create Tinsley Meadows Primary School was agreed by Cabinet on 16th April 2014 and planning permission was granted in July 2015, and is surprised that if the main opposition group have genuine concerns they have not raised them until now;
- (b) believes that it is imperative that the school is moved away from the motorway in order to alleviate noise and air pollution issues and the overwhelming evidence concerning air quality and children's health development;
- (c) recalls that none of the other options to relocate the school were viable and the decision facing the Administration was to leave the school where it was with the danger that presented to the health of local children or relocate it to the chosen site, and believes that the main opposition group should check their facts before making misleading assertions;
- (d) recognises the importance of protecting the local green space and notes that all efforts were made to keep the development to a quarter of the green space and commits to protecting the rest of the site from development;
- (e) notes that the school will continue to work with the community and offer community activity and support on the site, alongside providing a great inclusive education for children in Tinsley, in line with our corporate mission to make every school a great school;
- (f) commits to work with local young people to ensure they get best use of the pavilion, noting that the Administration has given Tinsley Forum a grant for the provision of activities for young people; and
- (g) recalls that Ochre Dike Playing Fields, Waterthorpe was protected due to plans to develop whilst the previous Administration was in control and is therefore astounded at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group.

(Notes 1. Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (b), (e) and (f) and against Paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (g) of the Substantive Motion and

asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted against Paragraph (c) and abstained on all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded).

## **11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE GLEDHILL**

### **Flood Defences**

It was moved by Councillor Julie Gledhill, seconded by Councillor Lewis Dagnall, that this Council:-

- (a) extends its sympathy and support for the people across the country affected by severe flooding over Christmas and the New Year;
- (b) notes that flooding is becoming the new norm in Britain, and recalls the flooding of Sheffield in June 2007 in which two people tragically died and millions of pounds worth of damage and disruption was caused;
- (c) understands that Sheffield's geography makes it vulnerable to flooding, and recognises that the city is in need of extra flood defences to better protect homes and businesses;
- (d) therefore welcomes the current Administration's plans, developed in partnership with the Environment Agency, to develop a comprehensive flood management capital programme involving five new major schemes which will provide protection for 6,000 homes and more than 1,700 businesses;
- (e) is, however, concerned that the Government has so far earmarked only £23 million of the £43 million required to build the defences;
- (f) notes figures from the National Audit Office which show that investment in flood defences delivers £9.50 in benefits per £1 spent;
- (g) notes that the Leader of the Council has recently written to the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer calling on the Government to meet the £20 million shortfall in funding so Sheffield can get the flood defences it urgently needs; and
- (h) notes that the current Administration has developed one of the largest flood protection programmes in the country and is committed to protecting Sheffield from flooding.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows and the relettering of original paragraphs (b) to (h) as new paragraphs (c) to (i):-
  - (b) believes that climate change makes extreme weather events,

including severe flooding, significantly more likely and agrees with the officer report establishing the Green Commission that “climate change is the biggest challenge facing our civilisation”;

2. the addition of new paragraphs (j) and (k) as follows:-
  - (j) further notes that the report from the Green Commission is still awaited; and
  - (k) calls on the Administration to set a date for the release of the report.

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

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

<p>RESOLVED: That this Council:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) extends its sympathy and support for the people across the country affected by severe flooding over Christmas and the New Year;</li><li>(b) notes that flooding is becoming the new norm in Britain, and recalls the flooding of Sheffield in June 2007 in which two people tragically died and millions of pounds worth of damage and disruption was caused;</li><li>(c) understands that Sheffield’s geography makes it vulnerable to flooding, and recognises that the city is in need of extra flood defences to better protect homes and businesses;</li><li>(d) therefore welcomes the current Administration’s plans, developed in partnership with the Environment Agency, to develop a comprehensive flood management capital programme involving five new major schemes which will provide protection for 6,000 homes and more than 1,700 businesses;</li><li>(e) is, however, concerned that the Government has so far earmarked only £23 million of the £43 million required to build the defences;</li><li>(f) notes figures from the National Audit Office which show that investment in flood defences delivers £9.50 in benefits per £1 spent;</li><li>(g) notes that the Leader of the Council has recently written to the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer calling on the Government to meet the £20 million shortfall in funding so Sheffield can get the flood defences it urgently needs; and</li><li>(h) notes that the current Administration has developed one of the largest flood protection programmes in the country and is committed to protecting Sheffield from flooding.</li></ol>
---

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

**State Pension Age Equalisation**

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Nasima Akther,

that this Council:-

- (a) recalls that:-
  - (i) the State Pension Age (SPA), created in the 1995 Pensions Act, set out incremental women's SPA rises from 60 to 65 to equalise with men's SPA; and
  - (ii) this was accelerated by the 2011 Pensions Act, so that women's SPA would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (b) welcomes the equalisation of the State Pension Age but is concerned that the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, leaving them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affecting their retirement plans;
- (c) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age; and
- (d) calls on the current Minister of State for Pensions to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by equalisation of the State Pension Age

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

- (b) welcomes the equalisation of the State Pension Age but is concerned that, due to the failure of previous Governments to properly communicate the changes to the State Pension Age for women born in the 1950's, many women only discovered the changes in 2009, or when they were contacted about the further, necessary, changes that were made in 2011, leaving them inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affecting their plans for retirement;
- (c) notes that, whilst in Government, Liberal Democrats worked hard to alleviate the impact of the equalisation by introducing £2bn worth of changes that meant for most women no more than 12 months was added to their State Pension Age (SPA), with an absolute maximum of 18 months, from the position they inherited from the previous Government; and
- (d) believes that more can be done to help those women affected and therefore calls on the current Minister of State for Pensions to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by equalisation of the State Pension Age.



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

(Note: Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for Paragraphs (b) and (d) and abstained on Paragraph (c) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recalls that:-
  - (i) the State Pension Age (SPA), created in the 1995 Pensions Act, set out incremental women's SPA rises from 60 to 65 to equalise with men's SPA; and
  - (ii) this was accelerated by the 2011 Pensions Act, so that women's SPA would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (b) welcomes the equalisation of the State Pension Age but is concerned that the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, leaving them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affecting their retirement plans;
- (c) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age; and
- (d) calls on the current Minister of State for Pensions to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by equalisation of the State Pension Age.

(Note 1. Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a) and (d) and against Paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (d) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

### **13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS**

#### **New Retail Quarter**

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that

this Council:-

- (a) notes that work has begun on Sheffield's new Chinatown development;
- (b) welcomes this development and believes that this is great news for Sheffield, which will bring £65 million of private foreign investment to regenerate part of the city and create 400 jobs;
- (c) believes that this is a great complement to the re-development of The Moor which was secured by the previous Administration and which is progressing at pace and on course for completion by the end of next year;
- (d) expresses disappointment at the rate at which the New Retail Quarter has progressed;
- (e) believes that the people of Sheffield have waited long enough for progress on the New Retail Quarter to be made; and
- (f) hopes that with the planning application submitted and a new developer soon to be announced there will be no further delays in the development.

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

- (c) welcomes the proactive measures taken by the present Administration to allow the development to be brought forward;
- (d) welcomes the redevelopment of the Moor under the present Administration;
- (e) further welcomes the series of actions taken by the present Administration to drive forward the city's New Retail Quarter, a crucial project for Sheffield, including:-
  - (i) securing the New Development Deal to inject funds into the retail quarter to bridge the financial gap facing the scheme;
  - (ii) parting company with Hammerson when they would not commit to start construction;
  - (iii) taking control of the scheme as a Council, working to redesign a new scheme that is viable and fit for purpose in the long term, and taking real action to make the scheme happen; and
  - (iv) securing the land and property needed to develop the scheme;
- (f) welcomes the interest from developers in the retail quarter and believes this is positive news which demonstrates viability and confidence in the new scheme; and

- (g) contrasts this action to the record of the previous Administration with three wasted years.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that work has begun on Sheffield's new Chinatown development;
- (b) welcomes this development and believes that this is great news for Sheffield, which will bring £65 million of private foreign investment to regenerate part of the city and create 400 jobs;
- (c) welcomes the proactive measures taken by the present Administration to allow the development to be brought forward;
- (d) welcomes the redevelopment of the Moor under the present Administration;
- (e) further welcomes the series of actions taken by the present Administration to drive forward the city's New Retail Quarter, a crucial project for Sheffield, including:-
  - (i) securing the New Development Deal to inject funds into the retail quarter to bridge the financial gap facing the scheme;
  - (ii) parting company with Hammerson when they would not commit to start construction;
  - (iii) taking control of the scheme as a Council, working to redesign a new scheme that is viable and fit for purpose in the long term, and taking real action to make the scheme happen; and
  - (iv) securing the land and property needed to develop the scheme;
- (f) welcomes the interest from developers in the retail quarter and believes this is positive news which demonstrates viability and confidence in the new scheme; and
- (g) contrasts this action to the record of the previous Administration with three wasted years.

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) and against Paragraphs (c) and (e) to (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRIAN WEBSTER**

**Sheffield City Region Devolution Proposals**

It was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the recent consultation on proposals for devolution of powers to the Sheffield City Region closed on January 15th;
- (b) notes that the consultation was only open for a period of roughly six weeks, that it was only late in this period that the consultation was publicised on the front page of the Council website, and does not believe this was sufficient to ensure a robust consultation providing the widest possible range of views from the people of the Sheffield City Region;
- (c) recalls that in a 2012 referendum the people of Sheffield voted decisively against the creation of the post of executive mayor for Sheffield City Council, and believes this shows strong strength of feeling across the city against centralising executive power in the hands of a single individual;
- (d) believes that while genuine devolution of powers to local authorities and cross-authority areas is an important objective in principle, the deal as proposed appears more concerned with seeking economic growth than with the genuine enhancement of local democracy;
- (e) therefore, calls upon the Administration to:-
  - (i) return to negotiations with the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make clear Sheffield City Council's opposition to the imposition of a mayor;
  - (ii) oppose, on behalf of the people of Sheffield, any devolution deal that includes as a prerequisite the creation of the post of Sheffield City Region Mayor; and
  - (iii) work with local authority leaders from across the Sheffield City Region and across the North of England to secure a better deal for the people of Sheffield; and
- (f) directs that copies of this motion be forwarded to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to the leaders of each local authority in the Sheffield City Region.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (e) and (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-

- (e) believes that this Administration, by signing the proposed devolution deal

which contains the condition of a mayor, has weakened any powers of negotiation over the Sheffield City Region devolution deal that we may have held.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith, 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 following the launch of the official consultation on the devolution proposals, the Leader of the Council stated that for Sheffield to support the proposal the following issues must be addressed:-
  - (i) Mayoral Model - we cannot have a situation where half of the combined authority are not involved in electing a mayor; and
  - (ii) Mayoral Veto – we cannot have a situation where the mayor would have a veto over every decision;
- (b) believes that Sheffield should not agree to bring forward the proposal until these issues are addressed;
- (c) notes that the Council hosted a scrutiny meeting involving external stakeholders where the proposals were given consideration;
- (d) further notes that the consultation has now closed and believes it is important to listen to the consultation responses of the people of Sheffield City Region before coming to any decision;
- (e) supports concerns that were raised at the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee about the consultation process; and
- (f) notes that any proposal must be agreed by Full Council, however, notes that there is no current specified date to bring the proposal to a Council meeting until the necessary changes have been made.

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 following the launch of the official consultation on the devolution

proposals, the Leader of the Council stated that for Sheffield to support the proposal the following issues must be addressed:-

- (i) Mayoral Model - we cannot have a situation where half of the combined authority are not involved in electing a mayor; and
  - (ii) Mayoral Veto – we cannot have a situation where the mayor would have a veto over every decision;
- (b) believes that Sheffield should not agree to bring forward the proposal until these issues are addressed;
- (c) notes that the Council hosted a scrutiny meeting involving external stakeholders where the proposals were given consideration;
- (d) further notes that the consultation has now closed and believes it is important to listen to the consultation responses of the people of Sheffield City Region before coming to any decision;
- (e) supports concerns that were raised at the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee about the consultation process; and
- (f) notes that any proposal must be agreed by Full Council, however, notes that there is no current specified date to bring the proposal to a Council meeting until the necessary changes have been made.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (e) and against all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER**

### **Coal Industry**

It was moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council:-

- (a) believes a relentless attack on Great Britain's coal and heavy industry continues unabated, and that the few remaining miners of this country, the salt of the earth, were brought to tears by the closure of Kellingley Colliery a week before Christmas 2015;
- (b) notes that Kellingley Colliery was the last deep coal mine operating in Great Britain, and is situated at Beal in North Yorkshire, three and a half miles east of Ferrybridge power station;
- (c) further believes “the powers that be” have now conspired to destroy our country's last remaining underground kingdom of coal;

- (d) also believes that, in effect, the badges and slogans that proclaim "Coal Not Dole" around Sheffield and in this Council Chamber have been washed away, like tears in the rain;
- (e) regrets that the island of Great Britain, which stands with enough coal under its ground sufficient for 500 years' use, now imports coal from all over the world;
- (f) believes that if Great Britain is to have energy security and cheap, plentiful, reliable sources of power, coal must be a part of the solution, and that it is a crying shame that more of the coal we use will now be mined from under some other nation's footprint instead of our own;
- (g) places on record its conclusion that politics is too important to be left in the hands of our current crop of national politicians; and
- (h) suggests that a copy of this motion should not be sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, for fear it would cause bewilderment and confusion.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, 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) was saddened to hear news of the closure of Kellingley Colliery, Britain's last deep coal mine, and the loss of 450 jobs;
- (b) further regrets that the Government refused to extend a loan facility to Hatfield Colliery last summer, leading to its closure;
- (c) believes that the decimation of the mining industry was led by the Government of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s and is appalled that during this period she was being cheered on by UKIP Leader Nigel Farage, who was a member of the Conservative Party whilst Mrs Thatcher was Prime Minister;
- (d) recalls UKIP Leader Nigel Farage declaring in 2013 that he was the only politician "keeping the flame of Thatcherism alive";
- (e) further notes the comments by Nigel Farage that UKIP are "the true inheritors of Thatcher" and talking about Mrs. Thatcher said "I think she would get involved in UKIP";
- (f) believes UKIPs claims to be a champion of the mining industry hypocrisy at its worst when they continue to back a leader who idolised the Prime Minister who embarked upon a personal crusade to destroy miners, their families and communities for political reasons;

- (g) notes that in a few years' time there will be a new market for coal with a clean coal power station at Drax, but that market will be supplied by imported coal, with all the environmental costs of shipping coal to Britain; and
- (h) recognises the labour of all the miners who have worked in Britain's coal industry over the last century and regrets that their jobs have been lost for generations.

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

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (a) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) to (h) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) was saddened to hear news of the closure of Kellingley Colliery, Britain's last deep coal mine, and the loss of 450 jobs;
- (b) further regrets that the Government refused to extend a loan facility to Hatfield Colliery last summer, leading to its closure;
- (c) believes that the decimation of the mining industry was led by the Government of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s and is appalled that during this period she was being cheered on by UKIP Leader Nigel Farage, who was a member of the Conservative Party whilst Mrs Thatcher was Prime Minister;
- (d) recalls UKIP Leader Nigel Farage declaring in 2013 that he was the only politician "keeping the *flame of Thatcherism* alive";
- (e) further notes the comments by Nigel Farage that UKIP are "the true inheritors of Thatcher" and talking about Mrs. Thatcher said "I think she would get involved in UKIP";
- (f) believes UKIPs claims to be a champion of the mining industry hypocrisy at its worst when they continue to back a leader who idolised the Prime Minister who embarked upon a personal crusade to destroy miners, their families and communities for political reasons;
- (g) notes that in a few years' time there will be a new market for coal with a clean coal power station at Drax, but that market will be supplied by imported coal, with all the environmental costs of shipping coal to Britain; and
- (h) recognises the labour of all the miners who have worked in Britain's coal



industry over the last century and regrets that their jobs have been lost for generations.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (a) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) to (h) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAZHER IQBAL**

### **Student Maintenance Grants**

It was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Mick Rooney, that this Council:-

- (a) condemns the Government's decision to abolish maintenance grants for lower income students and replace them with a loans system from September 2016;
- (b) notes that around 40% of students at Sheffield Hallam University are reliant on maintenance grants to help fund their studies;
- (c) is concerned that:-
  - (i) abolishing maintenance grants will make life harder for students from low income backgrounds, and could deter some from entering higher education; and
  - (ii) the Government's own Equality Impact Assessment reveals a risk to the participation of students from poorer backgrounds, women, BME students, mature students and disabled students;
- (d) recalls comments from the Rt. Hon. Lord David Willetts, former Universities Minister, in 2010: "Our proposals [tuition fee rise] are progressive because they help to encourage people from poorer backgrounds to go to university because of the higher education maintenance grant...";
- (e) agrees with Dapo Adaramewa, Sheffield Hallam Students' Union President, that turning the grants into loans "flies in the face of the poorer students who are being saddled with even more debt";
- (f) notes research from the Institute for Fiscal Studies which found that scrapping maintenance grants will mean the poorest 40 per cent of university students in England will graduate with debts of up to £53,000, rather than £40,500 at present;
- (g) believes that higher education should be accessible to all, including those from low income backgrounds; and
- (h) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Education Secretary to reverse this decision.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) and (f) as follows and the relettering of the original paragraphs (e) to (h) as new paragraphs (g) to (j):-

- (e) notes that increased maintenance grants were a key protection brought in by the Liberal Democrats when tuition fees were raised and have meant that in recent years more students from poorer background have gone to university than ever before;
- (f) regrets the removal of NHS bursaries for student nurses;

On being put to the vote, Paragraph (f) of the amendment was carried and Paragraph (e) was negated.

(Note 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Dianne Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur voted for Paragraph (f) and against Paragraph (e) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (f) and abstained on Paragraph (e) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) condemns the Government's decision to abolish maintenance grants for lower income students and replace them with a loans system from September 2016;
- (b) notes that around 40% of students at Sheffield Hallam University are reliant on maintenance grants to help fund their studies;
- (c) is concerned that:-
  - (i) abolishing maintenance grants will make life harder for students from low income backgrounds, and could deter some from entering

- higher education; and
- (ii) the Government's own Equality Impact Assessment reveals a risk to the participation of students from poorer backgrounds, women, BME students, mature students and disabled students;
  - (d) recalls comments from the Rt. Hon. Lord David Willetts, former Universities Minister, in 2010: "Our proposals [tuition fee rise] are progressive because they help to encourage people from poorer backgrounds to go to university because of the higher education maintenance grant...";
  - (e) regrets the removal of NHS bursaries for student nurses;
  - (f) agrees with Dapo Adaramewa, Sheffield Hallam Students' Union President, that turning the grants into loans "flies in the face of the poorer students who are being saddled with even more debt";
  - (g) notes research from the Institute for Fiscal Studies which found that scrapping maintenance grants will mean the poorest 40 per cent of university students in England will graduate with debts of up to £53,000, rather than £40,500 at present;
  - (h) believes that higher education should be accessible to all, including those from low income backgrounds; and
  - (i) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Education Secretary to reverse this decision.

## **17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS**

### **Community Pubs**

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that Sheffield is world famous for its pubs and real ale, and last year was named by the New York Times as the beer capital of Britain;
- (b) recognises the important role local pubs play in the life of our city by providing a community hub for residents to meet, relax, debate and do business;
- (c) notes the recent study by Oxford University for Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) which found that people who have a "local" pub are "significantly" happier, have more friends, better life satisfaction, and drink in moderation compared to those who haven't;
- (d) regrets the decline of community pubs in recent years and notes that last year, figures revealed 46 pubs had shut across Sheffield since 2010;

- (e) notes the recent rejection by this Administration of 9 applications to give some of our city's best known pubs Asset of Community Value status on the ground that they have no community;
- (f) believes that the Administration is being too stringent in its definition of 'community' and that a community can be defined other than by geography; and
- (g) calls on the Administration to support Sheffield's pubs by:-
  - (i) reassessing the definition of community that it uses for Asset of Community Value applications;
  - (ii) supporting community groups who wish to register their local pubs as assets of community value; and
  - (iii) amending local planning policies to stipulate that no pub will be allowed to change use unless it is demonstrated that continued trading is not economically viable and that the premises has been marketed as a pub unsuccessfully for a stipulated minimum period.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Peter Price, seconded by Councillor Sioned Mair-Richards, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (d) to (g) and the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (f) as follows:-

- (d) regrets the decline in the number of pubs in the city, and understands that this is part of a national trend which can be explained by a range of factors including higher taxes on alcohol, competition from supermarkets selling cheap alcohol and changing demographics; and
- (e) understands that:-
  - (i) the Council assess all nominations for Assets of Community Value status impartially and on a case by case basis, according to the Localism Act 2011 and guidance issued in 2012 by the Coalition Government, of which the main opposition group was a part; and
  - (ii) when assessing nominations, the decision maker acts only on the information provided in each application and makes no presumptions regarding what is and isn't a community for the purposes of that nomination; and
- (f) notes that there is a review of the assessment process underway, with a view to simplifying the process, which will be developed bearing in mind the comments of all 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 Sheffield is world famous for its pubs and real ale, and last year was named by the New York Times as the beer capital of Britain;
- (b) recognises the important role local pubs play in the life of our city by providing a community hub for residents to meet, relax, debate and do business;
- (c) notes the recent study by Oxford University for Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) which found that people who have a "local" pub are "significantly" happier, have more friends, better life satisfaction, and drink in moderation compared to those who haven't;
- (d) regrets the decline in the number of pubs in the city, and understands that this is part of a national trend which can be explained by a range of factors including higher taxes on alcohol, competition from supermarkets selling cheap alcohol and changing demographics;
- (e) understands that:-
  - (i) the Council assess all nominations for Assets of Community Value status impartially and on a case by case basis, according to the Localism Act 2011 and guidance issued in 2012 by the Coalition Government, of which the main opposition group was a part; and
  - (ii) when assessing nominations, the decision maker acts only on the information provided in each application and makes no presumptions regarding what is and isn't a community for the purposes of that nomination; and
- (f) notes that there is a review of the assessment process underway, with a view to simplifying the process, which will be developed bearing in mind the comments of all interested parties.

**18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK CLARKSON**

**Court Martial of Sergeant Blackman**

It was moved by Councillor Jack Clarkson, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council:-

- (a) asks what other country in the world would pay lawyers to persecute its own soldiers, our very own war heroes;
- (b) believes that the current practice of pursuing soldiers who have fought for

this country in Iraq, Afghanistan and Ulster, whereby many soldiers have had investigators turn up at their home addresses asking questions on their door steps regarding their military actions, of men and women who were simply carrying out orders, is deplorable and is nothing more than a “witch hunt”;

- (c) believes that this is beyond comprehension, and unless an individual has served on a battlefield/front, you cannot imagine what it must have been like to fight for your life, or to have lost a fellow comrade, shot or blown to pieces by an improvised explosive device (IED);
- (d) is concerned that Sergeant Alexander Blackman (Marine 'A') was sent to prison not by a British jury but by a military Court, and believes that if Sergeant Blackman had been judged by the ordinary public (i.e. a Jury) the result would have been somewhat different; Sergeant Blackman was prepared to die for his country, a man who signed up to be a soldier, who we expected to fight, and believes that the Government let Sergeant Blackman down, didn't support him as a soldier and has hung him out to dry; and
- (e) supports the release of Sergeant Blackman and will not rest until the “witch hunt” against our soldiers in the British Army comes to an end

(Note: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion, Councillor Jack Clarkson, Paragraph (b) of the Motion was altered by the addition of the words “and women” after the words “of men”.)

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

- (a) wishes to place on record its respect and appreciation for members of the armed forces and the work they do to keep our country safe;
- (b) notes the action the current Administration has taken to support the armed forces, including the community covenant - a pledge to commit to improving the transition from service life into civilian life for local residents and their families;
- (c) sympathises with the case of Sergeant Blackman, and notes that new and potentially significant information came to light following the publication of a military report into the incident in September which contained several issues which were never put to the court martial panel and could have significantly helped Sergeant Blackman's case, including the finding that commanders had missed signs that Sergeant Blackman and his men were showing evidence of "moral regression, psychological strain and fatigue"; and
- (d) notes the fact that MPs from various political parties have expressed similar

sympathies.

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

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) wishes to place on record its respect and appreciation for members of the armed forces and the work they do to keep our country safe;
- (b) notes the action the current Administration has taken to support the armed forces, including the community covenant - a pledge to commit to improving the transition from service life into civilian life for local residents and their families;
- (c) sympathises with the case of Sergeant Blackman, and notes that new and potentially significant information came to light following the publication of a military report into the incident in September which contained several issues which were never put to the court martial panel and could have significantly helped Sergeant Blackman's case, including the finding that commanders had missed signs that Sergeant Blackman and his men were showing evidence of "moral regression, psychological strain and fatigue"; and
- (d) notes the fact that MPs from various political parties have expressed similar sympathies.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

This page is intentionally left blank



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 4 March 2016, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Julie Gledhill 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 Mohammad Maroof
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed	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> Garry Weatherall	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Aodan Marken Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain Talib Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Chris Peace	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
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> Dianne Hurst 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 Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

**1. HARRY HARPAM M.P.**

- 1.1 Following the recent passing of former Councillor, Harry Harpham M.P., Members observed a minutes silence in his memory.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Isobel Bowler, Sheila Constance, Gill Furniss, Alan Law and Vickie Priestley.

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

- 3.1. There were no declarations of interest by Members of the Council.
- 3.2 Prohibition from voting on the grounds of Council Tax arrears
- 3.2.1 No Members declared an inability to vote on the setting of the Council Tax on the grounds explained above.

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

Petitions

4.1 Petition in respect of Homelessness

- 4.1.1 The Council received a petition containing over 30,000 signatures requesting the Council to open up an unused building for the homeless.

- 4.1.2 It had been agreed with the organiser of the petition that it would be submitted as an “ordinary” petition in view of the fact that a petition on the same subject had been debated at the January meeting of the Council.

- 4.1.3 The wording of the petition was as follows:-

*‘After recent visits to Sheffield I have come across at least 4 of the people I help to be covered in cuts and bruises because they have been violently attached whilst trying to sleep.*

*We really need to help put a stop to the abuse and homelessness these guys suffer on a daily basis.*

*Please could we sign and share and together we could make a massive change to help the more vulnerable and less fortunate.’*

- 4.1.4 Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Kelly Licence, who added that she helped around 25-30 of those out on the streets every week but there was an increasing need for support and something needed to be done.
- 4.1.5 Matthew Mckenney added that all funding for the support came from volunteers and the public. Any night shelter had to be paid for and, as this often came to around £25 a night, many of those who were homeless could not afford to fund this.
- 4.1.6 Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing, thanked Ms. Licence for the petition and for the work carried out. Although the original petition had been submitted to an earlier meeting, she welcomed the petition also being submitted to this meeting as the homelessness problem was getting worse due to the Government's policies. The petition would be considered at a future meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

4.2 Petition in respect of Road Safety outside Brightside Nursery and Infant School

The Council received a petition, containing 114 signatures, requesting road safety measures in the vicinity of Brightside Nursery and Infant School. Representations were made by Rebecca Larkin. She commented that there were only two signs warning motorists that there was a school and these were next to the school which did not give motorists enough warning to slow down.

- 4.2.1 A parent who had been in contact with the Council since 2012 requesting road safety measures had recently been involved in an accident with their child near to the school which had left their child in a critical condition.
- 4.2.2 There were numerous incidents of motorists going through red lights near to the school. One of the biggest requirements was better school signage and this could also mean the introduction of a speed restriction zone, a warning light or cameras on the traffic lights.
- 4.2.3 The pavement on Jenkin Road needed an assessment as it was currently not wide enough for parents and children to walk side by side and as a result was extremely dangerous and required the caution of parents. There was also a need for railings on the corner of Jenkin Road and Holywell Road. Ms. Larkin would be willing to discuss any potential measure with the Council to improve safety around the school.
- 4.2.4 Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, thanked Ms. Larkin for the petition. He was aware of the situation as he had relatives who attended the school. There were a number of road safety issues and Councillor Fox had spoken to School Governors about the problems.
- 4.2.5 There were a number of areas across the City which needed road safety measures and unfortunately there were a number of motorists who ignored traffic calming measures. Councillor Fox would welcome a meeting with the petitioner to look at all the possible measures to address the situation.

Public Questions

4.3 Public Question in respect of the Northern Powerhouse

Dawn Sanders commented that there had been a number of recent stories in the press in respect of the so-called 'Northern Powerhouse'. There appeared to be mixed messages as despite the Government's comments about the Northern Powerhouse most of their spending still appeared to focus on the South of the country. Clarification was therefore needed. How was the Council seeking to jump start the Northern economy when at the same time they were accepting cuts from Central Government?

4.3.1 Councillor Julie Dore, Leader of the Council, commented that this was an issue raised constantly in the North. It was an issue that was pertinent to what would be discussed at today's meeting in respect of unfair and unnecessary cuts which seemed to affect those more in the North than in the South.

4.3.2 On the one hand the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government were promoting the North around the world as the place to invest whilst at the same time disinvesting in the North by taking jobs and the money down South.

4.3.3 There were two potential forthcoming hopes for the City. The first of which was devolution where discussions had been held with the Government for a number of months to ensure the City Region got the best deal. The second was Transport For the North which was soon to become a statutory body with plans for infrastructure and investment in the City. Further funding and powers would be sought for this to improve interconnectivity across the region.

4.3.4 The City Region and the City were working hard to fight against the Government cuts whilst arguing for further devolution to create jobs which were badly needed across the City.

4.4 Public Question in respect of Budgets

4.4.1 Heather Parys asked, given that budgets are being cut across the City, should the Members of the Council not accept a cut in their allowances?

4.5 Public Question in respect of Budgets

4.5.1 Michael Barge commented that the Council had debts of £467m. He asked where had this debt come from and did it suggest competent financial management by this and previous administrations?

4.5.2 In response to the questions in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5, Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that this did not demonstrate incompetence. Any borrowing was used to invest such as for the Sheffield Retail Quarter and improvements to schools, homes and leisure centres in order to deliver a vibrant City.

- 4.5.3 Councillor Curran added that Members allowances had been frozen for the past 6 years. The number of Special Responsibility Allowances had been reduced and Councillors no longer had a pension. Spending on Members allowances had fallen by £267k over the last 5 years.
- 4.6 Public Question in respect of the Housing and Planning Bill
- 4.6.1 Shirley Frost asked would the Council acknowledge the national campaign being waged against the Housing and Planning Bill initiated by Defend Council Housing, a tenant led non-party political campaign and stand up and be counted at the national demonstration in London on 13 March?
- 4.6.2 Ms. Frost further requested that the Council tell all the tenants, housing workers and Councillors the truth that the Conservative Government's Housing and Planning Bill 2015 was designed and intended to destroy Council housing for purely ideological and self serving reasons by means of insecure short term tenancies instead of secure lifetime tenancies, means tested/market style rents for households with an income of £30,000 plus and forced sales of the Council's high value homes into the private sector with no compensation which tenants have fully paid for through their rents and that this will drain the Housing Revenue Account of monies and services needed to maintain and improve its 40,000 properties to a decent standard, put housing workers jobs at risk, create fear and insecurity now and for the existing 40,000 and future Council tenants, break up communities and social cohesion, be to the detriment of large areas of the City and make the waiting list longer.
- 4.6.3 Ms. Frost requested that the Council acknowledge that the politicians alone could not stop this Bill becoming law and that extra parliamentary action was needed to stop it devastating people's needs and that tenants had a right to know how they were going to be affected and a right to defend themselves.
- 4.6.4 Ms. Frost further asked the Council to give every possible support to this campaign by following the excellent example set by Camden Council and Nottingham City Homes by urging the City's tenants and residents associations to support the national campaign, making a statement that expresses this and canvass local newspapers and radio to relay this message, organising a high profile public meeting with supportive speakers as a call to action as a matter of urgency to Sheffield tenants that they had a right to defend themselves, their homes, their communities and their future, agreeing to cross-party support for the campaign until the Bill had been defeated, setting up a joint campaign task group composed of tenants, Councillors, housing workers and their trade unions to monitor the passage of the Bill, its aftermath if it is passed and take appropriate action to stop it devastating tenants, homes and communities and liaising with local Housing Associations and their tenants for an inclusive and City wide campaign.
- 4.6.5 Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing commented that she supported every word of Ms. Frost's question. Councillor Paul Wood had brought a motion to the previous month's Council meeting in respect of this which had been passed. The issue had also been discussed at a recent meeting of the City

Wide Forum. Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Equality, would be meeting with Ms. Frost and a public meeting would be organised.

4.6.6 Councillor Dunn had spoken to John Healey M.P. (Shadow Housing and Planning Minister) about the issue and he had raised it in Parliament. Although it was an issue which was at the forefront of Members' discussions, it had largely been ignored in the media as it focused on social housing. Therefore, Councillor Dunn encouraged Ms. Frost and others to keep demonstrating against the Bill so that the media begin to recognise the strength of people's feeling. The Council would be mounting a campaign against the Bill.

4.7 Public Question in respect of Dropped Kerbs

4.7.1 Martin Brighton stated that the Disability Equality Hub had prioritised public transport, and similar representations had been made at the Age Equality Hub and the Housing Equality Group and especially from a community group in the South West of the City.

4.7.2 Mr Brighton added that the statutory principle within the Equalities Act was that installing drop kerbs to provide wheelchair users access to bus stops was a 'reasonable adjustment'. It was pleasing therefore for Mr Brighton to hear at the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) public meeting of last Monday that the Council would be installing drop kerbs appropriately near to bus stops so that wheelchair users would no longer be excluded from public transport, and that the work can be included within the Amey remit.

4.7.3 To help the Council identify where the drop kerbs were needed throughout the City, could this Council consider inviting all community groups, including TARA's, to visit the bus stops in their area to determine whether or not they were accessible to wheelchair users and would the Council please publish a timescale for completion of this work?

4.7.4 Councillor Terry Fox commented that the public meeting referred to by Mr Brighton had been a very productive meeting. Drop kerbs would be installed following the completion of Streets Ahead work but it was difficult to confirm exact timescales for this at this stage. These issues may be discussed with the Transport 4 All Group and if any TARA representative wished to write in to discuss equality issues this would be looked into.

4.8 Public Question in respect of an Elected Member

4.8.1 Martin Brighton commented that at the last Cabinet meeting he asked a series of questions that concerned an unnamed Elected Member who was present at the meeting today. Would the Council Leader, for the benefit of the press, public and all Elected Members, please identify that Elected Member here and now?

4.8.2 Councillor Julie Dore responded that as Mr Brighton had not named the Elected Member she did not know who the question referred to.

4.9 Public Question in respect of Council Officers

4.9.1 Martin Brighton asked if the Chamber thought it reasonable that when a senior officer made a statement or promise or undertaking, that that person should be trusted to keep their word? Did the Chamber also think it reasonable that when a senior officer did not keep their word, they could and should be named here and now? This question also applied to Elected Members.

4.9.2 Councillor Julie Dore stated that the Council had a complaints procedure and a Standards Committee and if Mr Brighton believed he had evidence of inappropriate behaviour it should be referred through those processes.

4.10 Public Question in respect of Honesty and Accountability

4.10.1 Martin Brighton asked if the Chamber agreed with published assertions that political pragmatism, damage limitation and reputation management had primacy over openness, honesty and accountability?

4.10.2 Councillor Julie Dore responded that she did not agree with this.

4.11 Petition in respect of 20mph Zone around Walkley Primary School

4.11.1 The Council received a petition containing 55 signatures, requesting a a 20mph zone be introduced around Walkley Primary School.

4.11.2 There was no speaker to the petition.

4.11.3 The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

4.12 Petition in respect of Cuts in Funding for 'Walking for Health'

4.12.1 The Council received a petition containing 30 signatures, requesting the Council to reconsider its decision to cease funding the Walking for Health Co-ordinators post.

4.12.2 There was no speaker to the petition.

4.12.3 The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Equality.

**5. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

5.1 RESOLVED: That on the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, it be approved that Councillor Ian Saunders be appointed as the Council's Heritage Champion.

**6. ESTABLISHMENT AND APPOINTMENT OF A REPRESENTATIVE TO THE JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE TO SUPPORT HEALTH SERVICE CHANGE IN SOUTH AND MID YORKSHIRE, BASSETLAW AND NORTH DERBYSHIRE.**

6.1 The Director of Policy, Performance and Communications submitted a report outlining proposals for the establishment and appointment of a representative to the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Support Health Service Change in South and Mid Yorkshire, Bassetlaw and North Derbyshire.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Council approves the recommendations set out in the report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Communications now submitted regarding the Council's participation in the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee to support health service change in south and mid Yorkshire, Bassetlaw and North Derbyshire, as follows:-

- (a) join the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee to support health service change in South and Mid Yorkshire, Bassetlaw and North Derbyshire;
- (b) appoint the Chair of the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee, or her nominee, to serve as a Member of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and
- (c) delegate approval of the terms of reference of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee to the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.

**7. POLLING DISTRICT AND POLLING PLACE REVIEW**

7.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report outlining proposals to allocate Polling Districts and Polling Places following the recent Ward Boundary changes.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Council approves the changes to polling district and polling place boundaries for Sheffield, as set out in the report of the Chief Executive now submitted, with the correction now reported relating to the Broomhall Polling District, which is within the new Broomhill & Sharrowvale Ward, not within the new City Ward as indicated in the report.

**8. SUSPENSION OF PROCEDURAL RULES**

8.1 **RESOLVED:** On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that as regards item 7 on the agenda for this meeting (Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/17), 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.

## **9. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016/17**

- 9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Pat Midgley and formally seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that the following decisions taken by the Cabinet at its meeting on 17th February, 2016, 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 2016/17**

“RESOLVED: That the Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 4th March 2016 that:-

- (a) a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £406.492m is approved;
- (b) a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,360.48 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept) is approved;
- (c) the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report are approved;
- (d) based on the estimated expenditure level set out in Appendix 3 to this report, it be noted that the amounts shown in part B of Appendix 6 would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (e) it be noted 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, as outlined in Appendix 4 of the report;
- (f) the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire 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 be noted;
- (g) the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 168 be approved;

- (h) the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position be noted;
- (i) the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the report and the recommendations contained therein be approved;
- (j) the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the report be approved;
- (k) authority is 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;
- (l) the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15 May 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17;
- (m) foregoing an annual increase in the Members' allowances in 2016/17 is approved;
- (n) a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the report is approved;
- (o) authority be delegated to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2016/17;
- (p) authority be delegated to the Executive Director, Communities to set – subject to budgetary constraints – a framework of care home & home care fee increases with effect from 1 April 2016; and
- (q) the resolution of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, at its meeting held on 17 February 2016, in consideration of the Revenue Budget 2016/17 report, be supported and this be referred to all Sheffield Members of Parliament and Members of the House of Lords.”

**CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016/17**

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 4th March 2016 that:-

- (a) it notes the specific projects included in the years 2016-17 to 2021-22 programmes included in Appendix 9 to the report, and that Block allocations were included within the programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals would be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (b) it notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021-22 as at Appendix 9 to the report; and

- (c) it approves the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) policy, outlined in Appendix 4 of the report, such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports would be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve.”

9.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2016, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/17, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) regrets that since 2010, the previous coalition government and the current government have decimated central government funding to Sheffield City Council, and notes that the Council's funding from central government has been cut by around a half and the Council has had to make cuts of over £300 million;
- (2) recalls that in the original 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review, the Coalition Government committed to eliminating the deficit within four years, meaning that the Council's 2016/17 budget was estimated to be the second year that the cuts were over;
- (3) believes that the fact that the Council now faces further cuts over coming years is a damning indictment of the failure of the previous coalition government who failed to eliminate the deficit despite inflicting unprecedented cuts to public services;
- (4) regrets that the current government are continuing the previous coalition government's policy of cutting local government services to the bone at the same time as giving tax cuts benefiting millionaires;
- (5) recalls the comments of the former Liberal Democrat MP and Chief Secretary to the Treasury, Danny Alexander, that local government had “borne the brunt of deficit reduction” under the previous coalition government;
- (6) notes that last year's Comprehensive Spending Review outlined plans to virtually eradicate central government grant funding for local authorities and believes that leaving only Council Tax and business rates to fill the gap is completely inadequate to fund the services local people need, particularly given ever escalating costs of services such as social care;
- (7) regrets that like the previous coalition government, who gave some of the wealthiest areas of the country virtually no cuts at the same time as hitting northern towns and cities the hardest, the current government at the last minute introduced a fund to bail out the wealthy Conservative-controlled councils to appease backbench Conservative MPs;

- (8) notes that out of the £300 million relief fund, of which Sheffield will receive nothing, the largest beneficiary will be Surrey, which will get £24m, with £19m going to Hampshire, £16m to Hertfordshire, £14m to Essex, £12m to West Sussex, £11m to Kent and £9m to Buckinghamshire, and in total 83% of the funding has been given to Conservative-controlled councils, typically in the most affluent areas of the country, whilst councils in more deprived areas with the greatest level of need are not being supported despite receiving much greater cuts over the last five years;
- (9) believes this politically motivated fund to bail out wealthy Conservative-controlled councils is a disgrace, especially given the fact that they were given relative protection from cuts under the previous coalition government;
- (10) fully opposes the reported Government plans to abolish attendance allowance as part of business rate localisation as a further cynical ploy to devolve cuts and supports the petition to Government on the 38 Degrees website "Don't abolish attendance allowance" which has received over 100,000 signatures and notes the legitimate concerns expressed in the petition "The government claims that local authorities will step in to fill the gap in provision created by scrapping attendance allowance. But in the face of sweeping cuts imposed on their budgets, local authorities may find that administering such an allowance is beyond their means. What guarantees will there be that local authorities will have sufficient funds to match the current rates?";
- (11) believes that given the dreadful financial settlement given to the Council and the terrible legacy of the Coalition Government on local government finance, the present Administration have protected front line services as far as possible and focused on protecting services for the most vulnerable;
- (12) believes that due to the magnitude of government cuts over the past six years and increased pressure on services, it is unavoidable to increase Council Tax by 1.99 percent, which equates to 33p a week for most households;
- (13) further believes it is unavoidable to implement the Chancellor's social care "precept" of two per cent; the new national policy announced in last year's spending review and believes this is just another example of a cynical ploy by the Government who promised not to increase taxes but are forcing the increases on local authorities;
- (14) notes that the precept fails to address the increased cost of providing social care alone and believes that the real issues that the Government must address is the funding of local authorities and tackling the social care crisis, however, believes it would be irresponsible not to use this funding to protect care services as far as possible;
- (15) welcomes the commitment of the present Administration to increase the Council Tax Hardship fund by an extra £200,000 this year to help those who

struggle to be able to pay their bills;

- (16) 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 over the past year which has seen more of the Council's 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;
- (17) therefore welcomes the innovative new scheme developed by the Administration to incentivise a number of local employers to pay the Living Wage through offering business rate discounts to employers who choose to do so as a means of supporting them with the extra costs as a transitional arrangement and welcomes that the Administration proposes to make £250,000 of the projected revenue underspend available to achieve this, meaning the fund becomes £500,000 with the other 50% being funded from the collection fund;
- (18) believes the Sheffield approach is in stark contrast to the Chancellor who, as reported, simply believes it is adequate to re-brand the National Minimum Wage as the National Living Wage, which does not meet the cost of living as calculated by the Living Wage Foundation;
- (19) recalls that the Council Tax Hardship Fund was a scheme developed and implemented by the present Administration as a means of protecting those hardest hit by the Coalition Government's cuts to Council Tax Support;
- (20) welcomes the action taken by the Administration to give greatest protection to frontline services by focusing savings to accommodation costs, IT and corporate services to ensure these functions are operating as efficiently as possible;
- (21) notes that over the past four years, the Council has made £6.8 million in management savings, which includes savings to the Housing Revenue Account, and asks the Chief Executive to undertake a further review to make further savings as the Council faces further cuts in the coming years;
- (22) recalls that in addition to decimating local government funding, the Government is also hitting small businesses hard through the abolition of the Retail Rate Relief;
- (23) believes that the proposal will have a damaging impact on Sheffield and could hinder attempts to bring empty shops back into use, and therefore proposes to use £185,000 of the projected revenue underspend to develop a local rate relief scheme targeted at bringing empty shops back into use and believes that this proposal will have a positive impact on neighbourhoods who suffer when local shops in their community are empty;
- (24) regrets the impact that the cuts to local government funding have had on

communities across the city and welcomes the commitment of the present Administration to allocate £137,000 of the projected revenue underspend to fund community projects, responding to requests that have been made from local communities to improve their areas;

- (25) notes that as a result of budget cuts, there could be up to 400 Council posts affected during the financial year 2016/17, including job roles that could be lost through voluntary severance or voluntary early retirement, as well as any vacancies that have not been filled;
- (26) 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;
- (27) places on record its thanks to the 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;
- (28) requests the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/2017 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

**Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend**

<b>Savings proposals</b>	<b>(£'000)</b>	<b>Spending proposals</b>	<b>(£'000)</b>
<i>Temporary reductions in spending:</i>		<i>Temporary additions to budget:</i>	
Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend <i>(The carry forward from the 2015/16 budget is subject to approval by Cabinet at its meeting on 9 March 2016. If this carry forward is not approved by Cabinet the amount will be met from Reserves)</i>	523	Bringing Empty Shops Back Into use - business rate relief to bring empty properties into use	185
Remainder of 2014/15 underspend available <i>(This was approved by Cabinet as part of the 2014/15 outturn report)</i>	49	Living Wage Business Rate Relief - to encourage local businesses to pay Living Wage	250
		Community Investments - working with local communities to improve their area	137

<b>Use of projected revenue underspend sub-total</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>One-off spending proposals sub-total</b>	<b>572</b>

- (29) notes those specific projects included in the years 2016/17 to 2021/22 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, and that block allocations are 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;
- (30) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021/22 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme;
- (31) 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 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (32) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2016/17, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £406.057m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph (28) above, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

**Summary Revenue Budget**

<b>Original Budget 2015/16</b>		<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
65,980	Children Young People and Families	66,423
156,215	Communities	153,902
126,520	Place	129,101
2,292	Policy Performance and Communications	1,900
54,135	Resources	52,224
<b>405,142</b>		<b>403,550</b>
	<b>Corporate Budgets:</b>	
	<b>Specific Grants</b>	
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-73,442	PFI Grant	-74,601

-7,738	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-9,323
-1,916	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,490
-2,500	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,880
-100	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	0
-500	Retail Relief (RR)	0
-53	Local Support Services Grant	0
-2,216	Independent Living Fund	-2,216
<b>Corporate Items</b>		
8,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
-17,289	Pension Costs	-18,846
6,391	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	8,405
-2,000	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
3,000	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	4,555
24,913	Schools and Howden PFI	25,094
1,400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	600
34	Payment to Parish Councils	27
300	ICT Refresh	300
-1,783	CAPITA Contract Savings*	0
0	Better Care Fund	-9,300
0	Pension Deficit Payment	80,100
3,327	Other	1,067
37,184	Capital Financing costs	31,995
28,073	MSF capital financing costs	28,199
28,032	Contribution to Reserves	-54,282
<b>424,060</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>406,057</b>
<b>Financing of Net Expenditure</b>		
-115,837	Revenue Support Grant	-90,592
-105,661	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-106,131
-28,883	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-29,124
-170,379	Council Tax income	-176,467
-3,300	Collection Fund surplus	-283
0	Social Care Precept	-3,460
<b>-424,060</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-406,057</b>

\* The total Capita savings for 2016/17 are £3.4m but are reflected as a budget reduction within the Resources portfolio instead of a Corporate Saving.

\*\* The Communities portfolio budget includes £131.1m for Adult Social Care (ASC) in 2015/16. The ASC budget will increase by £3.5m in 2016/17, funded by the social care precept.



- (33) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,360.48 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (34) 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 (28) above;
- (35) notes the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position;
- (36) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (37) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (38) 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;
- (39) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and for 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17;
- (40) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2016/17;
- (41) approves a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (42) 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 2016/17;
- (43) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 168 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (44) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £503,423 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (45) 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;

- (46) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £406.057m set out in paragraph (32) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

**Appendix 6a**

**CITY OF SHEFFIELD**  
**CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17 REVENUE BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2016, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2016/17
  - (a) for the whole Council area as:  
**132,253.72** (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 2016/17 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 179,927,895.**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£1,370,154,044** 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) **£1,189,722,727** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£180,431,317** 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) **£1,364.2816** 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) **£503,423** 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) **£1,360.4751** 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. **£3,460,485** The amount set by the authority at 2 above, under Section 30 of the Act, includes an amount attributable to the adult social care precept.
6. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 to 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 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

<b>Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53
<b>Bradfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Bradfield Parish Council	26.32	30.71	35.10	39.48	48.26	57.03	65.81	78.97
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50
<b>Ecclesfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.36	12.09	13.81	15.54	18.99	22.45	25.90	31.08
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61
<b>Stocksbridge Town Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.24	23.62	26.99	30.37	37.11	43.86	50.61	60.73
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26

7. 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 2016/17	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95

South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53
Bradfield Parish Council	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26

**Appendix 6c**

**Parish Council Precepts**

Parish Council	2015/16					2016/17					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	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	3.00%
Total/average	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	18,417.19	476,153	25,8537	27,270	503,423	2.69%

(NOTE: The Deputy Lord Mayor took the Chair for part of the above item of business).

**Motion to move to next business**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, 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 (55) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain),  
The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise

Fox), Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Diane Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur

Against the amendment (24) - Councillors Richard Shaw, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker

Abstained on the amendment - Nil  
(0)

9.3 It was then moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 17th February, 2016, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/17, be replaced by the following resolution:-

That the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2016, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/17, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:

(1) notes that the people of Sheffield deserve a City Council that provides good value for money, is open for business, is responsive and listens to its residents, and protects both our environment and our heritage which makes Sheffield such a special place to live;

- (2) believes that for too long the people of Sheffield have been taken for granted by this Administration who refuse to listen and continues to allow poor and unpopular decisions such as:-
  - (i) the recent disastrous cuts to Sheffield bus services by the Sheffield Bus Partnership which saw Sheffield take the bulk of the cuts to South Yorkshire's transport budget;
  - (ii) the continued felling of many of Sheffield's healthy highway trees; and
  - (iii) the sale of Cobnar Cottage, that was gifted to the people of Sheffield by J.G. Graves and falls within the bounds of Graves Park, despite a 12,000 strong petition to stop the sale;
- (3) notes that whilst blaming financial pressures for the bulk of these decisions, with no date yet set for this Council to sign the devolution deal, £30million of funding for the Sheffield City Region is at risk if the devolution deal is not signed by this Council by the end of March, and believes that this is largely due to the failure of the Leader of the Council to negotiate a good deal for Sheffield;
- (4) regrets that because the proposed devolution deal was signed to meet the timetable set by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the timing of the Conservative Party Conference, important issues of governance remain unresolved, and failed to include contributions from many central government departments, and therefore, even if this deal is agreed, Sheffield and the wider City Region will remain highly dependent on Government spending decisions;
- (5) furthermore, condemns the missed opportunities overseen by the current Administration, leading to additional pressures on our budget, noting in particular:-
  - (i) that this city remains saddled with the debt run up by previous Labour administrations, including around £25 million every year until 2024 to pay off the disastrous World Student Games despite the fact that the Don Valley Stadium has now been demolished; and
  - (ii) that this Administration has splashed out millions on high paid consultants, Council offices and political pet projects, squandering funds which can never be regained for local taxpayers;
- (6) notes that whilst the Liberal Democrats were in government, Sheffield City Council was given a total of £15.704 million to help freeze Council Tax for a fifth consecutive year, saving families around £200 cumulatively by the fifth year;
- (7) notes under the new Conservative Government, this funding is no longer available and the Government is attempting to force local authorities to raise taxes;
- (8) condemns the current Government's intention within this Parliament to remove

all Revenue Support Grant, and is concerned that the resulting mix of Council Tax, Business Rates, and fees and charges do not provide a sound basis for covering all current Sheffield City Council services;

- (9) notes that under the current Government's proposals, growth in business rates are even more important for a successful city and as income for the City Council, but believes that due to the mismanagement of the project by the Administration on the New Retail Quarter, Sheffield's business rate income is lower than it should be;
- (10) notes the considerable increased demand on adult social care both locally and nationally, and believes this would be best funded by central government, including through the Better Care Fund, however, accepts the 2% national arrangement for the social care precept to cope with this demand when no other funding is forthcoming;
- (11) notes that in addition to the 2% adult social care precept, the Administration have chosen to raise Council Tax by 1.99%, bringing the total rise to 3.99%;
- (12) notes that this comes on top of increases in both the Fire and Rescue and Police and Crime precepts which will lead to a squeeze which will be felt by Sheffield tax payers city wide;
- (13) notes that, despite this, the Liberal Democrat alternative budget proposes only to take the 2% 'Osborne Tax' rise for adult social care and freeze the rest, 1.99% less than the Administration's budget, by making simple savings such as:-
  - (i) reducing budgets for Trade Union 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;
  - (iv) a reduction in pay for the very highest earners in the Council to produce a more equal structure; and
  - (v) giving staff an extra 3 days unpaid leave to protect Council jobs;
- (14) notes that these savings, along with the use of revenue underspend and New Homes Bonus, would enable the Council to continue to provide good value for money and work in a more business friendly, environmentally sustainable way by:-
  - (i) supporting hard-working Sheffield families suffering in the cost of living crisis by keeping their Council Tax down;
  - (ii) supporting city centre businesses by instigating free parking on Sundays, in line with other large cities;



- (iii) supporting Associate Libraries by employing professional librarian support;
  - (iv) reversing cuts to the parks budget;
  - (v) upping investment in brownfield sites to protect our green open spaces from development;
  - (vi) researching into the possibility of a ‘Sheffield Pound’ – a local currency which would help local independent businesses;
  - (vii) giving local people a greater say in how money is spent in their area by giving more control and funding to Local Area Partnerships;
  - (viii) supporting our local shopping centres by further investment in our local shopping centres in Woodseats and Hillsborough; and
  - (ix) the creation of a new ‘Community Environmental Fund’ – an additional pot of money for local communities to decide how best they would like to invest in their environment – whether that be the retention of highway trees, cycle lanes or inventive recycling schemes;
- (15) therefore requests the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council’s Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/2017 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

<b><u>Revenue Budget proposal</u></b>					
<b>Savings proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Spending proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<i>Permanent reductions in spending:</i>			<i>Permanent additions to budget:</i>		
Additional 3 days unpaid leave for all staff	1,200		Keep Council Tax down for Sheffield taxpayers	3,450	
Delete 4 Senior Manager posts	200		Instigate free parking on Sundays	235	
Reduce the number of Trade Union convenors	313		Restore some of the recent changes to bus routes	320	

Delete Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Advisors	45		Professional support for associate libraries	70	
Remove Leader's Policy Officer post	30		Reverse cuts to Parks and Countryside contract payments	45	
Deletion of posts within the Policy Team	64		<b>Permanent additions to budget - subtotal</b>		<b>4,120</b>
Pay review – 10% reduction for staff on a salary of >£80k (assume 6 months savings)	105		Work with community groups to investigate the possibility of a Sheffield Pound (funded by New Homes Bonus)	25	
Reduce posts within Communications team	115		<b>Temporary additions to budget - subtotal</b>		<b>25</b>
Withdraw funding for Sheffield First partnership	25				
Reduce posts in Sustainable Cities team	22				
Set a modest target for shared services between Sheffield trusts	50				
Set a modest savings target for shared services with other Local Authorities in Sheffield City Region	100				
Deletion of posts in the 'Office Accommodation Strategy' team	60				
<b>Permanent reductions in spending - subtotal</b>		<b>2,329</b>			
Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend <i>(The carry forward from the 2015/16 budget is subject to approval by Cabinet at its</i>	523				

<i>meeting on 9 March 2016. If this carry forward is not approved by Cabinet the amount will be met from Reserves)</i>					
Use of unallocated New Homes Bonus (NHB)	1,293				
<b>Temporary reductions in spending - subtotal</b>		<b>1,816*</b>			
<b>Revenue saving sub-total</b>		<b>4,145</b>	<b>Revenue spending sub-total</b>		<b>4,145</b>

*\* Advice of the Chief Executive & the Section 151 Officer*

*The Council has always applied the approach that NHB funding is to be used to fund one-off schemes that support growth, housing and infrastructure. As NHB funding is a time-limited funding source, the Council's view has been that it is not prudent to use these funds to support on-going annual revenue expenditure. Using NHB to support revenue spend is not a sustainable strategy, as it simply defers identifying spending reductions for one year. It also displaces various growth, infrastructure etc schemes that would have been brought forward to be funded by NHB.*

*In addition there is already a significant degree of risk in our on-going revenue budgets. In particular the 2016/17 revenue budget includes £24.6m of pressures, and similar levels of pressures are anticipated for 2017/18, as there is a further RSG reduction of £22.8m in 17/18. The Council's 2016/17 budget also includes £9.3m of one-off funding for the Better Care Fund that has not been confirmed beyond 2016/17, so resources to fund some or all of this amount might have to be identified in 2017/18.*

*Consequently officers' advice is that it would not be prudent to add a requirement to identify a further £1.816m reduction in our 2017/18 budget, which would be necessitated if NHB and the 2015/16 non-recurrent underspend are used to reduce Council Tax income. For the avoidance of doubt, officers are not saying that the use of these monies in this way would be unlawful, however we would advise against it because it is likely to lead to an unsustainable future budget.*

<b>Capital Budget</b>			
<b>Capital spending proposal</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Devolve spending of Successful Centres Programme funds to Local Area Partnerships	300	Re-allocation of Continuation of Successful Centres Programme (£300k)	300

Increasing investment in brownfield sites (funded by NHB)	200	Use of unallocated New Homes Bonus (NHB)	807
Regeneration project for Woodseats District Centre (funded by NHB)	150		
Regeneration project for Hillsborough District Centre (funded by NHB)	150		
Creation of a 'Community Environmental Fund' (funded by NHB)	307		
<b>Capital spending total</b>	<b>1,107</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals total</b>	<b>1,107</b>

- (16) notes those specific projects included in the years 2016/17 to 2021/22 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (15) above, and that block allocations are 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;
- (17) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021/22 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (15) above;
- (18) 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 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (19) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2016/17, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £403.042m, 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  
2015/16**

**Original  
Budget  
2016/17**

**£000**

**£000**

<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>		
65,980	Children Young People and Families	66,020
156,215	Communities	153,459
126,520	Place	129,409
2,292	Policy Performance and Communications	1,363
54,135	Resources	51,526
<b>405,142</b>		<b>401,779</b>

**Corporate Budgets:**

**Specific Grants**

0	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2014/15	0
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-73,442	PFI Grant	-74,601
-7,738	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-9,323
-1,916	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,490
-2,500	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,880
-100	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	0
-500	Retail Relief (RR)	0
-53	Local Support Services Grant	0
-2,216	Independent Living Fund	-2,216

**Corporate Items**

8,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
-17,289	Pension Costs	-18,846
6,391	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	8,405
-2,000	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
3,000	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	4,555
24,913	Schools and Howden PFI	25,094
1,400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	600
34	Payment to Parish Councils	27
300	ICT Refresh	300
-1,783	CAPITA Contract Savings*	0
0	Better Care Fund	-9,300
0	Pension Deficit Payment	80,100
3,327	Other	1,067
37,184	Capital Financing costs	31,995
28,073	MSF capital financing costs	28,199
28,032	Contribution to Reserves	-55,526

<b>424,060</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>403,042</b>
----------------	--------------------------	----------------

**Financing of Net Expenditure**

-115,837	Revenue Support Grant	-90,592
-105,661	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-106,566
-28,883	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-29,124

-170,379	Council Tax income	-173,017
-3,300	Collection Fund surplus	-283
0	Social Care Precept	-3,460
<b>-424,060</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-403,042</b>

\* The total Capita savings for 2016/17 are £3.4m but are reflected as a budget reduction within the Resources portfolio instead of a Corporate Saving.

\*\* The Communities portfolio budget includes £131.1m for Adult Social Care (ASC) in 2015/16. The ASC budget will increase by £3.5m in 2016/17, funded by the social care precept.

- (20) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,334.39 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 2.00% (0.00% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (21) 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;
- (22) notes the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position;
- (23) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (24) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (25) 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;
- (26) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and for 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (15) above relating to the deletion of Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Advisors;
- (27) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2016/17;
- (28) approves a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (15) above relating to the reduction in pay for staff on a salary above £80K;
- (29) 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 2016/17;

- (30) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 168 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (31) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £503,423 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 £403.042m set out in paragraph (19) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

**Appendix 6a**

**CITY OF SHEFFIELD**  
**CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17 REVENUE BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

- 1. It be noted that on 15th January 2016, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2016/17
  - (a) for the whole Council area as:  
**132,253.72** (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 2016/17 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 176,477,895.**
- 3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£1,367,713,044** 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) **£1,190,731,727** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£176,981,317** 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) **£1,338.1954** 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) **£503,423** 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) **£1,334.3889** 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. **£3,460,485** The amount set by the authority at 2 above, under Section 30 of the Act, includes an amount attributable to the adult social care precept.
6. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 to 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 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

<b>Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	889.59	1,037.86	1,186.12	1,334.39	1,630.92	1,927.45	2,223.98	2,668.78
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32



Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,036.79	1,209.58	1,382.38	1,555.18	1,900.78	2,246.37	2,591.97	3,110.36
<b>Bradfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	889.59	1,037.86	1,186.12	1,334.39	1,630.92	1,927.45	2,223.98	2,668.78
Bradfield Parish Council	26.32	30.71	35.10	39.48	48.26	57.03	65.81	78.97
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,063.11	1,240.29	1,417.48	1,594.66	1,949.04	2,303.40	2,657.78	3,189.33
<b>Ecclesfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	889.59	1,037.86	1,186.12	1,334.39	1,630.92	1,927.45	2,223.98	2,668.78
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.36	12.09	13.81	15.54	18.99	22.45	25.90	31.08
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,047.15	1,221.67	1,396.19	1,570.72	1,919.77	2,268.82	2,617.87	3,141.44
<b>Stocksbridge Town Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	889.59	1,037.86	1,186.12	1,334.39	1,630.92	1,927.45	2,223.98	2,668.78
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.24	23.62	26.99	30.37	37.11	43.86	50.61	60.73
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,057.03	1,233.20	1,409.37	1,585.55	1,937.89	2,290.23	2,642.58	3,171.09

7. 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.

<b>Appendix 6b</b>								
Council Tax Schedule 2016/17	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	889.59	1,037.86	1,186.12	1,334.39	1,630.92	1,927.45	2,223.98	2,668.78
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,036.79	1,209.58	1,382.38	1,555.18	1,900.78	2,246.37	2,591.97	3,110.36
Bradfield Parish Council	1,063.11	1,240.29	1,417.48	1,594.66	1,949.04	2,303.40	2,657.78	3,189.33
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,047.15	1,221.67	1,396.19	1,570.72	1,919.77	2,268.82	2,617.87	3,141.44
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,057.03	1,233.20	1,409.37	1,585.55	1,937.89	2,290.23	2,642.58	3,171.09

**Appendix 6c**

**Parish Council Precepts**

Parish Council	2015/16					2016/17					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	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	3.00%
Total/average	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	18,417.19	476,153	25,8537	27,270	503,423	2.69%

**Motion to move to next business**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, 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 (16) - Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Katie Condliffe
- Against the amendment (60) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox), Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Robert Murphy, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Diane Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur
- Abstained on the amendment (0) - Nil

9.4 It was then moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment that the recommendations of the Cabinet

held on 11<sup>th</sup> 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) thanks the officers of the Council and in other organisations directly affected by the austerity programme in the way they have responded to the cuts and made sacrifices;
- (3) notes that, this year, over £9 million of additional cuts are needed because of pressures and additional spending, which we believe arises from the lack of flexibility in long-term outsourced contracts with just two private companies, specifically the Waste Management and Streets Ahead contracts;
- (4) further notes the intention of Government to reduce the main source of local authority funding, the Revenue Support Grant, to nil and to switch funding to business rates in their own areas, a move which will favour more affluent areas of the country;
- (5) therefore recognises that austerity is not going to go away and that Elected Members in Sheffield, however difficult the crisis we face, have a responsibility to do the best they 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;
- (6) believes that the people of this city want a Council that listens to them and takes their genuinely-expressed concerns into account;
- (7) therefore, will open up Council meetings to public scrutiny by online web broadcasting;
- (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 and press work;
- (9) will install a maximum 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 over £50,000 a year;
- (10) will further reduce up to 2 posts in the HR Service to protect frontline services;
- (11) will reduce cuts to services for the older and disabled people and help ensure decent pay and conditions for care staff, putting an extra £253k into adult social care;
- (12) regrets not having taken up the option of a significant investment in jobs in the

- renewable energy industry when proposed in 2014, to reduce fuel bills and create an income stream for other services, and also regrets abandoning the subsequent scheme adopted in 2015 once the Government reduced support for renewable energy in favour of dirty sources such as nuclear, diesel and fracking;
- (13) believes, however, this Council can use the economies of scale available to it and will invest in a further scheme of solar panel installation on the Council's housing stock by re-prioritising capital funding within the Housing Revenue Account;
- (14) will create or maintain further jobs by setting aside unallocated New Homes Bonus funding to identify and survey brownfield sites for re-use for new housing and business, so as to minimise the impact of new building on the green belt or those brownfield sites that provide particular benefits to wildlife or the local community;
- (15) will also create jobs by setting aside further unallocated New Homes Bonus funding to invest in a fund for energy efficiency schemes in maintained schools;
- (16) will put further resources into turning empty properties into much needed homes by investing a small amount of New Homes Bonus funding in further enforcement work in this area, which will in turn generate increased NHB funding as homes are brought back into occupation;
- (17) will also reverse the proposed cut in private sector housing, in order to ensure higher standards in this sector;
- (18) will use the £523,000 one-off sum from the Council's 2015/16 underspend to:
- (i) develop proposals to introduce a workplace parking scheme, to improve air quality and generate further revenue for public transport investment;
  - (ii) develop proposals to offer more policing and services related to the night-time economy by ensuring high-value businesses make an appropriate contribution to social costs through use of a night-time levy scheme;
  - (iii) double the sum available for discretionary spending by councillors on small-scale ward-level projects;
  - (iv) increase the hardship fund to £1m to alleviate the impact of increased Council Tax bills, in particular on the 30,000 lowest-income households affected by the loss of Council Tax Benefit and that have seen by far the biggest increase in Council Tax in recent years; and
  - (v) will invest £20k of the Local Growth Fund (New Homes Bonus) to install solar panels on the Park Centre as part of its roof renovations,

thereby reducing fuel bills and increasing the sustainability of the building;

- (19) will reduce the price of permits in parking permit zones to 2010 levels by shifting the cost of parking in these residential PPZ to non-residents, meaning that people living in some of the most congested and polluted areas of the city are not subsidising other transport services;
- (20) further, will prioritise the installation of 20mph zones in areas with the worst road safety accident statistics and, therefore, will re-prioritise funding available in the Local Transport Plan programme to a default 20mph speed limit in the city centre;
- (21) recognises the importance of children learning to use public transport safely and therefore will provide funds to mitigate the impact of the 10p rise in children's bus fares;
- (22) will forego any increase in Members' allowances;
- (23) therefore requests the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/2017 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

<b>Revenue Budget</b>			
<b>Savings proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Spending proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<i>Permanent reduction in spending:</i>		<i>Permanent additions to budget:</i>	
Reduce pay on employees paid over £150,000 by 20% (assume 6 month saving)	24	Parking permit fees reduced to 2010 levels	297
Reduce pay on employees paid over £100,000 by 15% (assume 6 month saving)	59	Mitigate the impact on Sheffield children & young people of the decision to increase child concessionary single fares from 70p to 80p	440
Reduce pay on employees paid over £50,000 by 10% (assume 6 month saving)	475	Webcasting of all Full Council, Budget & Scrutiny meetings	30
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

Use of New Homes Bonus (to fund additional post in Private Sector Housing currently funded through Public Health)	24	Additional post in Private Sector Housing	24
Remove all group policy officer posts	91	Supporting the review of individual care packages to maintain quality of care across Communities	253
Removal of further 2 posts in HR	100	Establish discretionary fund for grants to encourage zero or low-emission taxi vehicles	5
Introduce increased on-street parking fees in PPZs (i.e. 30p increase over and above saving proposed in BIP)	405	Reverse proposed cuts to investment in the Alcohol Strategy [p160, F6]	128
<b>Revenue saving sub-total</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>Revenue spending sub-total</b>	<b>1,212</b>

<b><u>Capital Budget</u></b>			
<b>Capital spending proposal</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposal</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Investment in solar panels on 2000 council houses	6,052	Re-prioritise use of capital funding within HRA to fund the majority of the investment in solar panels on 2000 council houses	5,052
		Use of New Homes Bonus to fund the remainder of the investment in solar panels on 2000 council houses	1000
20's Plenty City Centre scheme	262	Re-prioritise Local Transport Plan Programme set aside for 20mph speed limit schemes	156
		Use of part of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend to cover part of	106

		the cost of the 20's Plenty City Centre scheme	
Install solar panels as part of roof replacement programme at Park Centre	20	Use of part of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend to cover cost of installing solar panels at Park Centre	20
Establishment of fund to prepare brownfield sites for redevelopment	500	Use of New Homes Bonus to establish fund to prepare brownfield sites for redevelopment	500
Energy efficiency for schools fund	500	Use of New Homes Bonus to establish fund for energy efficiency schemes in schools	500
<b>Capital spending total</b>	<b>7,334</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals total</b>	<b>7,334</b>

<b><u>Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend</u></b>			
<b>Savings proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Spending proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<i>Temporary reductions in spending:</i>		<i>Temporary additions to budget:</i>	
Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend <i>(The carry forward from the 2015/16 budget is subject to approval by Cabinet at its meeting on 9 March 2016. If this carry forward is not approved by Cabinet the amount will be met from Reserves)</i>	397	Developing proposals to introduce a workplace parking scheme	100
		Feasibility study into late night levy scheme	25
		Double the amount available for discretionary spending by local area partnerships for	72



		2016/17 only	
		Further increase of £200k to the Council Tax Hardship Fund for 2016/17 only	200
<b>Use of projected revenue underspend sub-total</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>One-off proposals sub-total</b>	<b>397</b>

- (24) notes those specific projects included in the years 2016/17 to 2021/22 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (23) above, and that block allocations are 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;
- (25) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021/22 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (23) above;
- (26) 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 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (27) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2016/17, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £406.492m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph (23) above, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

**Summary Revenue Budget**

**Original Budget 2015/16**

**£000**

65,980  
156,215  
126,520

**Portfolio budgets:**

Children Young People and Families  
Communities  
Place

**Original Budget 2016/17**

**£000**

66,258  
154,103  
129,475

2,292	Policy Performance and Communications	1,801
54,135	Resources	52,033
<b>405,142</b>		<b>403,669</b>

**Corporate Budgets:**

**Specific Grants**

-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-73,442	PFI Grant	-74,601
-7,738	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-9,323
-1,916	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,490
-2,500	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,880
-100	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	0
-500	Retail Relief (RR)	0
-53	Local Support Services Grant	0
-2,216	Independent Living Fund	-2,216

**Corporate Items**

8,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
-17,289	Pension Costs	-18,846
6,391	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	8,405
-2,000	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
3,000	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	4,555
24,913	Schools and Howden PFI	25,094
1,400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	600
34	Payment to Parish Councils	27
300	ICT Refresh	300
-1,783	CAPITA Contract Savings*	0
0	Better Care Fund	-9,300
0	Pension Deficit Payment	80,100
3,327	Other	1,267
37,184	Capital Financing costs	31,995
28,073	MSF capital financing costs	28,199
28,032	Contribution to Reserves	-54,166

<b>424,060</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>406,492</b>
----------------	--------------------------	----------------

**Financing of Net Expenditure**

-115,837	Revenue Support Grant	-90,592
-105,661	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-106,566
-28,883	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-29,124
-170,379	Council Tax income	-176,467
-3,300	Collection Fund surplus	-283
0	Social Care Precept	-3,460

<b>-424,060</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-406,492</b>
-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

\* The total Capita savings for 2016/17 are £3.4m but are reflected as a budget reduction within the Resources portfolio instead of a Corporate Saving.

\*\* The Communities portfolio budget includes £131.1m for Adult Social Care (ASC) in 2015/16. The ASC budget will increase by £3.5m in 2016/17, funded by the social care precept.

- (28) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,360.48 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (29) 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 (23) above;
- (30) notes the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position;
- (31) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (32) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (33) 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;
- (34) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and for 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17;
- (35) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2016/17;
- (36) approves a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (23) above relating to the reduction in pay for employees paid over £150k, £100k and £50k of 20%, 15% and 10% respectively;
- (37) 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 2016/17;
- (38) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below

paragraph 168 of the Revenue Budget report;

- (39) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £503,423 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (40) 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;
- (41) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £406.492m set out in paragraph (27) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

**Appendix 6a**

**CITY OF SHEFFIELD**  
**CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17 REVENUE**  
**BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

- 1. It be noted that on 15th January 2016, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2016/17
  - (a) for the whole Council area as:  
**132,253.72** (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 2016/17 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 179,927,895.**
- 3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£1,369,647,044** 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) **£1,189,215,727** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.

- (c) **£180,431,317** 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) **£1,364.2816** 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) **£503,423** 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) **£1,360.4751** 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. **£3,460,485** The amount set by the authority at 2 above, under Section 30 of the Act, includes an amount attributable to the adult social care precept.
6. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 to 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 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

<b>Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53

<b>Bradfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Bradfield Parish Council	26.32	30.71	35.10	39.48	48.26	57.03	65.81	78.97
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50
<b>Ecclesfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.36	12.09	13.81	15.54	18.99	22.45	25.90	31.08
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61
<b>Stocksbridge Town Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.24	23.62	26.99	30.37	37.11	43.86	50.61	60.73
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26

7. 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.

<b>Appendix 6b</b>									
Council Tax Schedule 2016/17	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95	
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26	
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32	
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53	
Bradfield Parish Council	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50	
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61	
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26	

**Appendix 6c**

**Parish Council Precepts**

Parish Council	2015/16					2016/17					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	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	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 (7) - Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy, Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker

Against the amendment (69)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox), Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Rob Frost, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Diane Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Garry Weatherall, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur

Abstained on the amendment (0)

- Nil

9.5 It was then moved by Councillor Jack Clarkson, seconded by Councillor John Booker, as an amendment that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2016, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/17, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) regrets the high levels of cuts that the Government is imposing on local authorities, and notes that more prosperous southern shire counties are suffering far less than northern towns and cities;
- (2) believes that a cut in the Revenue Support Grant of over £25 million in one year is both unacceptable and irresponsible, and that future cuts of a similar level will have a disastrous effect on the provision of public services in this city;
- (3) welcomes the fact that by the end of this Parliament, councils will be able to



retain all money raised through Business Rates, but urges that this process be speeded up in order to offset the loss of funding from the cuts in RSG;

- (4) believes that Britain's contribution of £13 billion to the European Union last year would have been better spent protecting frontline services from the Government's spending cuts, and that only by leaving the EU and restoring self-government can we ensure that our public services will be adequately funded in the future;
- (5) believes that the £52 billion the Conservative Government, supported by the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats, intends to spend on the HS2 vanity project would be better spent on investment in inadequate existing transport infrastructure and high speed broadband;
- (6) welcomes the extra funding that will be available to the Sheffield City Region as part of its proposed devolution deal, but is concerned about the potential lack of oversight and accountability of a powerful directly elected mayor between elections;
- (7) is concerned by what it believes to be exorbitant prices charged for some work carried out under the strategic preferred partnership contracts, and believes that the taxpayers of Sheffield would be better served by bringing a number of these services back in-house;
- (8) is appalled that previous administrations have allowed the Council to accrue outstanding loans to the value of £467 million, which amounts to over £800 for each resident of this city, and which will require interest payments in the financial year 2016/17 alone of £20 million;
- (9) believes that Council Members and executives must not be immune from savings, and proposes that they should set an example by making the following changes to pay and allowances:
  - (i) a 5% cut in the Basic Allowance paid to Members;
  - (ii) a 10% cut in Special Responsibility Allowances paid to eligible Members, and the abolition of the Cabinet Advisor SRA; and
  - (iii) a 10% cut in the salary of any Council employee paid over £100,000 per annum;
- (10) proposes to make further savings by cutting 10% from the translation and interpretation budget, with a view to introducing charges for non-statutory translation services as soon as possible;
- (11) proposes to improve the appearance of parts of the city by:
  - (i) moving the pest control service to a fully self-financing model to discourage fly tipping and poor refuse management practices;
  - (ii) employing two full time enforcement officers to target areas prone to

- fly tipping, littering, and poor refuse management practices; and
- (iii) funding an awareness and education campaign, including signs and leaflets, to discourage fly-tipping and littering and encourage proper refuse management practices;
- (12) proposes to use part of the New Homes Bonus to fund two floodlit football pitches and a covered area on vacant land on Wensley Street in S4, with the aim of bringing communities together and providing a recreation facility for local children and young people;
- (13) proposes to use £473,000 of the Council's underspend from the financial year 2015/16 to reverse some cuts to the Activity Sheffield budget, by awarding grants to community groups and organisations to provide:
- (i) pop-up gyms and boxing gyms in community centres and local venues;
  - (ii) fitness programmes, similar to the Bartendaz project in New York, promoting outdoor exercise and healthy living, and combating childhood obesity; tackling problems of crime, antisocial behaviour, and drug and solvent abuse; and working towards a more cohesive community; and
  - (iii) joint working with TARAs to realise these projects with the intention of having them in place for the start of the school summer holidays;
- (14) proposes to use the remainder of the savings identified in the 2016/17 Revenue Budget to provide mitigation for elderly and disabled residents of Sheffield to have free train travel in South Yorkshire;
- (15) therefore requests the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/2017 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

<b>Revenue Budget</b>			
<b>Savings</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Investments / spending proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<i>Permanent reductions in spending:</i>		<i>Permanent addition to budget:</i>	
Reduce Members' Basic Allowances by 5%	49	2 additional enforcement officer posts to target areas prone to fly-tipping	64

Reduce Members' Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) by 10%, and scrap SRAs for Cabinet Advisors	63	Mitigate the impact of transport cuts on Sheffield's elderly and disabled residents by reinstating free train travel within South Yorkshire	277
Reduce pay on employees paid over £100,000 by 10% (assume 6 month saving)	51		
Pest Control service to become fully self-financing	153		
Introduce charging policy for non-statutory translation & interpreting services to generate 10% saving	25		
<b>Revenue saving sub-total</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>Revenue spending sub-total</b>	<b>341</b>

<b><u>Capital Budget proposal</u></b>			
<b>Capital spending proposal</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Construction of 2 floodlit 3G football pitches with covered area at Wensley Street, Fir Vale	1,200	Use of New Homes Bonus to fund football pitches at Wensley Street	1,200
<b>Capital spending total</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals total</b>	<b>1,200</b>

<b><u>Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend</u></b>			
<b>Savings proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Spending proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
<i>Temporary reductions in spending:</i>		<i>Temporary addition to budget:</i>	
Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend <i>(The carry forward from the 2015/16 budget is subject to approval by Cabinet at its</i>	523	One-off communication and education campaign targeted at areas prone to fly-tipping	50
		Temporary and partial reversal of cuts to Activity	473

<i>meeting on 9 March 2016. If this carry forward is not approved by Cabinet the amount will be met from Reserves)</i>		Sheffield budget	
<b>Use of projected revenue underspend sub-total</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>One-off spending proposals sub-total</b>	<b>523</b>

- (16) notes those specific projects included in the years 2016/17 to 2021/22 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (15) above, and that block allocations are 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;
- (17) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021/22 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (15) above;
- (18) 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 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (19) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2016/17, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £406.492m, 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**

<b>Original Budget 2015/16</b>		<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
65,980	Children Young People and Families	66,415
156,215	Communities	153,756
126,520	Place	129,779
2,292	Policy Performance and Communications	1,770
54,135	Resources	52,216
<b>405,142</b>		<b>403,936</b>

**Corporate Budgets:**

**Specific Grants**

-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-73,442	PFI Grant	-74,601
-7,738	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-9,323
-1,916	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,490
-2,500	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,880
-100	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	0
-500	Retail Relief (RR)	0
-53	Local Support Services Grant	0
-2,216	Independent Living Fund	-2,216

**Corporate Items**

8,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
-17,289	Pension Costs	-18,846
6,391	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	8,405
-2,000	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
3,000	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	4,555
24,913	Schools and Howden PFI	25,094
1,400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	600
34	Payment to Parish Councils	27
300	ICT Refresh	300
-1,783	CAPITA Contract Savings*	0
0	Better Care Fund	-9,300
0	Pension Deficit Payment	80,100
3,327	Other	1,067
37,184	Capital Financing costs	31,995
28,073	MSF capital financing costs	28,199
28,032	Contribution to Reserves	-54,233

<b>424,060</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>406,492</b>
----------------	--------------------------	----------------

**Financing of Net Expenditure**

-115,837	Revenue Support Grant	-90,592
-105,661	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-106,566
-28,883	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-29,124
-170,379	Council Tax income	-176,467
-3,300	Collection Fund surplus	-283
0	Social Care Precept	-3,460

<b>-424,060</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-406,492</b>
-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

\* The total Capita savings for 2016/17 are £3.4m but are reflected as a budget reduction within the Resources portfolio instead of a Corporate Saving.

\*\* The Communities portfolio budget includes £131.1m for Adult Social Care (ASC) in 2015/16. The ASC budget will increase by £3.5m in 2016/17, funded by the social care precept.

- (20) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,360.48 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (21) 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;
- (22) notes the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position;
- (23) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (24) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (25) 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;
- (26) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and for 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (15) above relating to the reductions in Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances and the deletion of Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Advisors;
- (27) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2016/17;
- (28) approves a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (15) above relating to the reduction in pay for employees paid over £100K;
- (29) 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 2016/17;
- (30) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 168 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (31) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £503,423 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 £406.492m set out in paragraph (19) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

**Appendix 6a**

**CITY OF SHEFFIELD**  
**CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17 REVENUE BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2016, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2016/17
  - (a) for the whole Council area as:  
**£132,253.72** (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 2016/17 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 179,927,895.**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£1,370,283,044** 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) **£1,189,851,727** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£180,431,317** 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) **£1,364.2816** 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) **£503,423** 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) **£1,360.4751** 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. **£3,460,485** The amount set by the authority at 2 above, under Section 30 of the Act, includes an amount attributable to the adult social care precept.
6. 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 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

<b>Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53

<b>Bradfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								



	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Bradfield Parish Council	26.32	30.71	35.10	39.48	48.26	57.03	65.81	78.97
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50

<b>Ecclesfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.36	12.09	13.81	15.54	18.99	22.45	25.90	31.08
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61

<b>Stocksbridge Town Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.24	23.62	26.99	30.37	37.11	43.86	50.61	60.73
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26

7. 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.

<b>Appendix 6b</b>								
Council Tax Schedule 2016/17	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53
Bradfield Parish Council	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26

**Appendix 6c**

**Parish Council Precepts**

Parish Council	2015/16					2016/17					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	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	3.00%
Total/average	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,727	18,417.19	476,153	25,8537	27,270	503,423	2.69%

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

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

For the amendment (4) - Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker

Against the amendment (70) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox), Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble,

Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Diane Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Ste Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Garry Weatherall, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) regrets that since 2010, the previous coalition government and the current government have decimated central government funding to Sheffield City Council, and notes that the Council's funding from central government has been cut by around a half and the Council has had to make cuts of over £300 million;
- (2) recalls that in the original 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review, the Coalition Government committed to eliminating the deficit within four years, meaning that the Council's 2016/17 budget was estimated to be the second year that the cuts were over;
- (3) believes that the fact that the Council now faces further cuts over coming years is a damning indictment of the failure of the previous coalition government who failed to eliminate the deficit despite inflicting unprecedented cuts to public services;
- (4) regrets that the current government are continuing the previous coalition government's policy of cutting local government services to the bone at the same time as giving tax cuts benefiting millionaires;

- (5) recalls the comments of the former Liberal Democrat MP and Chief Secretary to the Treasury, Danny Alexander, that local government had “borne the brunt of deficit reduction” under the previous coalition government;
- (6) notes that last year’s Comprehensive Spending Review outlined plans to virtually eradicate central government grant funding for local authorities and believes that leaving only Council Tax and business rates to fill the gap is completely inadequate to fund the services local people need, particularly given ever escalating costs of services such as social care;
- (7) regrets that like the previous coalition government, who gave some of the wealthiest areas of the country virtually no cuts at the same time as hitting northern towns and cities the hardest, the current government at the last minute introduced a fund to bail out the wealthy Conservative-controlled councils to appease backbench Conservative MPs;
- (8) notes that out of the £300 million relief fund, of which Sheffield will receive nothing, the largest beneficiary will be Surrey, which will get £24m, with £19m going to Hampshire, £16m to Hertfordshire, £14m to Essex, £12m to West Sussex, £11m to Kent and £9m to Buckinghamshire, and in total 83% of the funding has been given to Conservative-controlled councils, typically in the most affluent areas of the country, whilst councils in more deprived areas with the greatest level of need are not being supported despite receiving much greater cuts over the last five years;
- (9) believes this politically motivated fund to bail out wealthy Conservative-controlled councils is a disgrace, especially given the fact that they were given relative protection from cuts under the previous coalition government;
- (10) fully opposes the reported Government plans to abolish attendance allowance as part of business rate localisation as a further cynical ploy to devolve cuts and supports the petition to Government on the 38 Degrees website “Don’t abolish attendance allowance” which has received over 100,000 signatures and notes the legitimate concerns expressed in the petition “The government claims that local authorities will step in to fill the gap in provision created by scrapping attendance allowance. But in the face of sweeping cuts imposed on their budgets, local authorities may find that administering such an allowance is beyond their means. What guarantees will there be that local authorities will have sufficient funds to match the current rates?”;
- (11) believes that given the dreadful financial settlement given to the Council and the terrible legacy of the Coalition Government on local government finance, the present Administration have protected front line services as far as possible and focused on protecting services for the most vulnerable;
- (12) believes that due to the magnitude of government cuts over the past six years and increased pressure on services, it is unavoidable to increase Council Tax by 1.99 percent, which equates to 33p a week for most households;
- (13) further believes it is unavoidable to implement the Chancellor’s social care

“precept” of two per cent; the new national policy announced in last year’s spending review and believes this is just another example of a cynical ploy by the Government who promised not to increase taxes but are forcing the increases on local authorities;

- (14) notes that the precept fails to address the increased cost of providing social care alone and believes that the real issues that the Government must address is the funding of local authorities and tackling the social care crisis, however, believes it would be irresponsible not to use this funding to protect care services as far as possible;
- (15) welcomes the commitment of the present Administration to increase the Council Tax Hardship fund by an extra £200,000 this year to help those who struggle to be able to pay their bills;
- (16) 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 over the past year which has seen more of the Council’s 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;
- (17) therefore welcomes the innovative new scheme developed by the Administration to incentivise a number of local employers to pay the Living Wage through offering business rate discounts to employers who choose to do so as a means of supporting them with the extra costs as a transitional arrangement and welcomes that the Administration proposes to make £250,000 of the projected revenue underspend available to achieve this, meaning the fund becomes £500,000 with the other 50% being funded from the collection fund;
- (18) believes the Sheffield approach is in stark contrast to the Chancellor who, as reported, simply believes it is adequate to re-brand the National Minimum Wage as the National Living Wage, which does not meet the cost of living as calculated by the Living Wage Foundation;
- (19) recalls that the Council Tax Hardship Fund was a scheme developed and implemented by the present Administration as a means of protecting those hardest hit by the Coalition Government’s cuts to Council Tax Support;
- (20) welcomes the action taken by the Administration to give greatest protection to frontline services by focusing savings to accommodation costs, IT and corporate services to ensure these functions are operating as efficiently as possible;
- (21) notes that over the past four years, the Council has made £6.8 million in management savings, which includes savings to the Housing Revenue Account, and asks the Chief Executive to undertake a further review to make further savings as the Council faces further cuts in the coming years;
- (22) recalls that in addition to decimating local government funding, the Government is

also hitting small businesses hard through the abolition of the Retail Rate Relief;

- (23) believes that the proposal will have a damaging impact on Sheffield and could hinder attempts to bring empty shops back into use, and therefore proposes to use £185,000 of the projected revenue underspend to develop a local rate relief scheme targeted at bringing empty shops back into use and believes that this proposal will have a positive impact on neighbourhoods who suffer when local shops in their community are empty;
- (24) regrets the impact that the cuts to local government funding have had on communities across the city and welcomes the commitment of the present Administration to allocate £137,000 of the projected revenue underspend to fund community projects, responding to requests that have been made from local communities to improve their areas;
- (25) notes that as a result of budget cuts, there could be up to 400 Council posts affected during the financial year 2016/17, including job roles that could be lost through voluntary severance or voluntary early retirement, as well as any vacancies that have not been filled;
- (26) 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;
- (27) places on record its thanks to the 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;
- (28) requests the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2016/2017 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

<b><u>Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend</u></b>			
<b>Savings proposals</b>	<b>(£'000)</b>	<b>Spending proposals</b>	<b>(£'000)</b>
<i>Temporary reductions in spending:</i>		<i>Temporary additions to budget:</i>	
Use of 2015/16 projected revenue underspend <i>(The carry forward from the 2015/16 budget is subject to approval by Cabinet at its meeting on 9 March 2016. If this carry</i>	523	Bringing Empty Shops Back Into use - business rate relief to bring empty properties into use	185

<i>forward is not approved by Cabinet the amount will be met from Reserves)</i>			
Remainder of 2014/15 underspend available <i>(This was approved by Cabinet as part of the 2014/15 outturn report)</i>	49	Living Wage Business Rate Relief - to encourage local businesses to pay Living Wage	250
		Community Investments - working with local communities to improve their area	137
<b>Use of projected revenue underspend sub-total</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>One-off spending proposals sub-total</b>	<b>572</b>

- (29) notes those specific projects included in the years 2016/17 to 2021/22 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, and that block allocations are 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;
- (30) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021/22 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme;
- (31) 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 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (32) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2016/17, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £406.057m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph (28) above, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

**Summary Revenue Budget**

<b>Original Budget 2015/16</b>		<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
65,980	Children Young People and Families	66,423

156,215	Communities	153,902
126,520	Place	129,101
2,292	Policy Performance and Communications	1,900
54,135	Resources	52,224
<b>405,142</b>		<b>403,550</b>

**Corporate Budgets:**

**Specific Grants**

-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-73,442	PFI Grant	-74,601
-7,738	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-9,323
-1,916	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,490
-2,500	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,880
-100	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	0
-500	Retail Relief (RR)	0
-53	Local Support Services Grant	0
-2,216	Independent Living Fund	-2,216

**Corporate Items**

8,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
-17,289	Pension Costs	-18,846
6,391	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	8,405
-2,000	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
3,000	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	4,555
24,913	Schools and Howden PFI	25,094
1,400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	600
34	Payment to Parish Councils	27
300	ICT Refresh	300
-1,783	CAPITA Contract Savings*	0
0	Better Care Fund	-9,300
0	Pension Deficit Payment	80,100
3,327	Other	1,067
37,184	Capital Financing costs	31,995
28,073	MSF capital financing costs	28,199
28,032	Contribution to Reserves	-54,282

<b>424,060</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>406,057</b>
----------------	--------------------------	----------------

**Financing of Net Expenditure**

-		
115,837	Revenue Support Grant	-90,592
-		
105,661	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-106,131
-28,883	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-29,124
-	Council Tax income	-176,467



170,379		
-3,300	Collection Fund surplus	-283
0	Social Care Precept	-3,460
<hr/>		
<b>424,060</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-406,057</b>

\* The total Capita savings for 2016/17 are £3.4m but are reflected as a budget reduction within the Resources portfolio instead of a Corporate Saving.

\*\* The Communities portfolio budget includes £131.1m for Adult Social Care (ASC) in 2015/16. The ASC budget will increase by £3.5m in 2016/17, funded by the social care precept.

- (33) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,360.48 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (34) 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 (28) above;
- (35) notes the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position;
- (36) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (37) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (38) 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;
- (39) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and for 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17;
- (40) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2016/17;
- (41) approves a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (42) 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 2016/17;

- (43) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 168 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (44) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £503,423 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (45) 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;
- (46) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £406.057m set out in paragraph (32) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

**Appendix 6a**

**CITY OF SHEFFIELD**  
**CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17 REVENUE**  
**BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

- 1. It be noted that on 15th January 2016, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2016/17
  - (a) for the whole Council area as:  
**132,253.72** (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 2016/17 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 179,927,895.**
- 3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2016/17 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£1,370,154,044** 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) **£1,189,722,727** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (c) **£180,431,317** 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) **£1,364.2816** 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) **£503,423** 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) **£1,360.4751** 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. **£3,460,485** The amount set by the authority at 2 above, under Section 30 of the Act, includes an amount attributable to the adult social care precept.
6. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 to 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 2016/17 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

<b>Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53
<b>Bradfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Bradfield Parish Council	26.32	30.71	35.10	39.48	48.26	57.03	65.81	78.97
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50
<b>Ecclesfield Parish Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.36	12.09	13.81	15.54	18.99	22.45	25.90	31.08
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61
<b>Stocksbridge Town Council</b>								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.24	23.62	26.99	30.37	37.11	43.86	50.61	60.73
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32

Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26
---------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

7. 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.

<b>Appendix 6b</b>									
Council Tax Schedule 2016/17	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	
Sheffield City Council	906.98	1,058.15	1,209.31	1,360.48	1,662.80	1,965.13	2,267.46	2,720.95	
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.09	52.60	60.12	67.63	82.66	97.69	112.72	135.26	
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	102.11	119.12	136.14	153.16	187.20	221.23	255.27	306.32	
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,054.18	1,229.87	1,405.57	1,581.27	1,932.66	2,284.05	2,635.45	3,162.53	
Bradfield Parish Council	1,080.50	1,260.58	1,440.67	1,620.75	1,980.92	2,341.08	2,701.26	3,241.50	
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,064.54	1,241.96	1,419.38	1,596.81	1,951.65	2,306.50	2,661.35	3,193.61	
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,074.42	1,253.49	1,432.56	1,611.64	1,969.77	2,327.91	2,686.06	3,223.26	

**Appendix 6c**

**Parish Council Precepts**

Parish Council	2015/16					2016/17					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	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	3.00%
Total/average	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	18,417.19	476,153	25,8537	27,270	503,423	2.69%

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

For the Motion (52)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox), Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Diane Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur

Against the Motion (19)

- Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross and Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker

Abstained on the Motion (3)

- Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy