



# Council

---

**Wednesday 5 April 2017**

**2.00 pm**

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

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

---

## COUNCIL

---

**Wednesday 5 April 2017, 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 Denise Fox)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Anne Murphy)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Andy Nash Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Andy Bainbridge Steve Wilson	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Nasima Akther Mohammad Maroof Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed Paul Scriven	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell Jack Scott
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Abdul Khayum Alan Law Abtisam Mohamed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> Mike Drabble Dianne Hurst Peter Rippon
4	<i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Michelle Cook Kieran Harpham Magid Magid	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Dawn Dale Peter Price Garry Weatherall
5	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Talib Hussain Mark Jones	14	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Cate McDonald Chris Peace	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Robert Murphy Moya O'Rourke	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Sue Auckland Steve Ayris	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Penny Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Craig Gamble Pugh Adam Hanrahan Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Lisa Banes Terry Fox Pat Midgley	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood

---

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  
5 APRIL 2017**

**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 records of the proceedings of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2017 and the special meeting of the Council held on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2017 (Budget Meeting) and to approve the accuracy thereof.

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

(a) 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.

(b) Petition Requiring Debate

The Council's Petitions Scheme requires that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. A qualifying petition has been received as follows:-

*Petition to "Save Ecclesall Road Trees"*

To debate a combined electronic and paper petition entitled "Save Ecclesall Road Trees, Sheffield". The online petition – <https://www.change.org/p/save-ecclesall-road-trees> - contains 3,214 supporters (as at 27th March) and the paper petition contains 2,700 signatures. The e-petition includes the following wording:-

*"We, the undersigned, refute the assertion that the felling of over one third of the street trees on Ecclesall Road, Sheffield is necessary. We demand, and believe it imperative, that sensitive, alternative highway engineering specifications for pavements and kerbs be adopted and implemented to enable the long-term retention of those mature street trees designated as damaging. We*

*also demand that those trees designated as dying be reconsidered in the light of the best arboricultural advice recently offered by experts such as Jeremy Barrell (BSc FArborA DipArb CBiol FICFor FRICS) with a view to retaining as many mature street trees on Ecclesall Road as possible and the felling of any of these trees be used only as a true last resort”.*

## **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://democracy.sheffield.gov.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 GEORGE LINDARS-HAMMOND**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that in 1986 the Conservative government deregulated the bus market here in Sheffield and throughout England (outside of London); this record of deregulation has seen fares rise faster than inflation, patronage fall by more than a third nationally and bus market monopolies have become the norm;
- (b) notes that the number of people using buses in South Yorkshire since the Conservatives' deregulation of the bus service has dropped significantly; according to figures from South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) there were 268,000,000 bus passengers in 1986 but now the number has fallen to

102,000,000; a drop in passenger numbers of 62%;

- (c) notes that this Administration is committed to improving the standards of the bus service and welcomes the positive work undertaken with the bus partnership to improve on bus services in the city;
- (d) believes that better bus services for the people of Sheffield are essential in providing affordable and convenient travel and notes that this Administration is actively exploring all options at its disposal to improve public transport in the city; in turn, reducing congestion and air pollution;
- (e) is encouraged that the forthcoming Bus Services Bill will allow local communities to have a much greater say over the operation of bus services in their area and hopes are raised that this Bill could go some way to re-regulating the bus industry;
- (f) notes, however, that despite positive aspects of the Bus Services Bill, including enhanced bus partnerships and greater franchising powers, there is considerable concern about the inclusion of Clause 21 when the Bill was proposed; the clause would have banned local authorities from forming and running their own bus companies in the future;
- (g) notes that municipal bus operators provide some of the best services in the country as evident by the service provided by Nottingham City Council which consistently performs well in all outcomes measures; being well used and good value for local taxpayers;
- (h) welcomes the work by the Labour Party in successfully implementing an amendment in the House of Lords to remove what this Council believes is a senseless clause; a clause which seems to be driven by an ideological commitment that the "market knows best" in providing public transport, despite extensive evidence to the counter;
- (i) regrets that despite Labour's victory in the Lords, the Government has reintroduced this clause during House of Commons Committee stage; and it is likely that Clause 21 will be reinstated into the Bus Services Bill when considered at the Report Stage and Third Reading commencing on 27 March;
- (j) believes that any attempts by the Government to reinstate the clause should be fought and supports Labour's opposition in Parliament; and
- (k) believes that the running of local bus services should be determined by the local communities they serve, and that all methods for

ensuring this is so should be at the disposal of local authorities; whether in the form of franchising, bus partnerships or by local authorities running services themselves.

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

That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the recent news that Sheffield City Region is set to partner Boeing, the world's largest aerospace company, in a deal worth millions of pounds to the city;
- (b) notes that this will be Boeing's first factory in Europe and that, alongside the University of Sheffield's Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC), this has further cemented Sheffield City Region's credentials as a global centre for innovation-inspired advanced manufacturing;
- (c) notes the significant national coverage the recent deals with Boeing and McLaren are bringing to the area and believes that under this Administration the message is clear: "Sheffield is open for business";
- (d) reaffirms that this Administration is committed to growing our local economy and is having great success in this; in turn, creating jobs and increasing living standards;
- (e) believes that this Administration's approach is in stark contrast to the Liberal Democrats who, when in national government, chose to make damaging cuts in funding for regional growth and failed to provide adequate financial support to local businesses and cancelled the Labour Government's loan to Sheffield Forgemasters;
- (f) notes that the recruitment for the proposed 2,300-square-metre Boeing Sheffield facility is anticipated to begin from late 2018, with a planned Boeing investment of more than £20 million into the site, and believes this demonstrates what can be achieved with a proactive approach to business creation and investment, as undertaken by this Administration; and
- (g) supports the Administration's commitment to making Sheffield a leader in advanced manufacturing in the country.

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

That this Council:-

- (a) recognises that, last June, the UK narrowly voted to leave the European Union;
- (b) however, regrets that the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Theresa May MP, has chosen the hardest and most divisive form of Brexit, choosing to take us out of the Single Market before she has even begun negotiations;
- (c) believes that leaving the Single Market was not on the ballot paper in the referendum and that it is a political choice made by this Government;
- (d) believes that membership of the Single Market is vital for the British economy and for the jobs of millions of British people;
- (e) condemns the Government for failing to guarantee the rights of 3 million EU citizens already living and working in the UK, which includes over 13,000 people in Sheffield;
- (f) believes that EU citizens need to be given clarity on where they stand, as do UK citizens resident elsewhere in the EU and that it is shameful that the Government have left them in limbo, lining them up to be used as bargaining chips in the forthcoming negotiations;
- (g) notes that there is almost 1000 NHS workers in Sheffield who are EU citizens, and that the NHS is reliant on skilled migrant labour from the EU and beyond, and is therefore deeply concerned by the 68 per cent increase in EU nurses handing in their resignations in 2016, compared to 2015;
- (h) notes that the Spring budget confirms just how damaging this Government's "Hard Brexit" plans are to Britain's public finances, with the UK now forecast to borrow an extra £100bn over the next 6 years than was expected before the referendum;
- (i) regrets that a further £60bn is to be stashed away by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Rt. Hon. Phillip Hammond MP, to mitigate the effects of a "Hard Brexit" and believes this money could have been better spent on public services, such as health and care services and education;
- (j) further regrets that Labour MPs and Lords, including many local figures, have followed the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP's lead and failed to oppose the Government's "Hard Brexit" plans, allowing the Government's Brexit Bill to pass through Parliament unamended without any guarantees for EU citizens in the UK or on the UK's membership of the single market; and
- (k) supports the Liberal Democrats policy to hold a referendum on the final Brexit deal and believes that the people should have the final



say over the Brexit deal, rather than just politicians in Westminster.

**10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR CRAIG GAMBLE PUGH**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that, through the Schools Fairer Funding Formula, the Government is imposing real term cuts on schools by freezing per-pupil funding while inflation and school costs, such as staff salary costs, employer pension and national insurance contributions, increase; which affect all schools and academies alike;
- (b) notes that the 'area cost adjustment' will still apply and that this system perpetuates the inherent unfairness of the system and, as according to the Government's own statistics, in Sheffield by 2019 there will be an average pupil funding decrease of approximately 10%, around £350 per pupil, and that, even with a new funding formula, 98% of schools will be worse off in real terms;
- (c) notes that, eventually, schools funding will be distributed by national government, not through local authorities and the Schools Forum, removing any local discretion, influence or accountability;
- (d) believes that these proposals create divisions between primary and secondary schools and pits local authorities, parts of our City and even neighbouring schools, against each other; at the same time as the Government is finding over £500m extra cash for its Free and Grammar School agenda - which this Council is totally opposed to;
- (e) believes that the Government is continuing to penalise small schools and effectively forcing them to look for economies of scale by joining a Multi Academy Trust, pushing its Academy Policy;
- (f) reaffirms its opposition to segregation and the creation of new grammar schools and believes that the evidence base for grammar schools improving social mobility is incredibly weak and the Government's decision is derived more from ideology than evidence;
- (g) believes that every child deserves the best possible start in life, and that an excellent education is central to this, yet this Government's Funding proposals will make it extremely difficult for schools to meet the increasing demand of pupil numbers or address the growing national crisis in teacher recruitment and retention; and
- (h) urges all schools, governors, parents, carers and students to join with the NUT, Unison, GMBU and the Council to support the More Funding for all Sheffield Schools' Campaign; fighting for more funding to be found for schools, not from the proposed redistribution

of cash between local authorities or from taking money from primary schools to give to secondary schools, but from new money; and encourages them to write to their local MPs to support the Campaign and to the Secretary of State for Education for the Government to review these proposals and find more money for our schools.

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

That this Council:-

- (a) opposes the decision to close Eastern Avenue Jobcentre on the basis of accessibility, capacity, impact on the community and inadequate departmental analysis & assessment of the impact itself;
- (b) believes that the process by which these proposals have been announced do not stand alone from the decision itself, with the initial decision having been made without conducting an impact assessment and without a clear picture of those individual claimants or future claimants whom it is likely to affect; including extremely vulnerable claimants with disabilities and mental health problems;
- (c) is concerned that the proposals are putting 70 jobs at risk and believes there are major concerns about whether claimants will be as well supported by a newly reconfigured service, with the local office potentially much further afield for claimants;
- (d) believes that even if these jobs are relocated, the changes to the service will take a large amount of workers out of the local community at Manor Top and this will impact on the area and local businesses;
- (e) notes that this Administration is vocal in its opposition to the damaging impact the closure of the Jobcentre could have on how vital employment support is provided, and believes that there is a need for these services to be as close to people as possible and yet the proposals do nothing for forming a serious joined-up strategy of how employment services should be run;
- (f) believes the proposed closure of Eastern Avenue Jobcentre is a bad decision by this Government and one which will become evidently worse as Universal Credit continues to be rolled out, as people who are in work will have to attend interviews at Jobcentres; and notes that, as such, councillors from this Administration have called on the Government to reconsider its decision; and furthermore, offers full support and solidarity to the Public and Commercial Services Union (PCS) in its campaign to keep the Centre open; and

- (g) notes that the public consultation has recently finished and that all nine Labour Councillors who represent the communities most affected – Park and Arbourthorne, Manor Castle and Richmond - submitted their objections to the plans, and hopes the Government takes heed of their advice and reconsiders those plans.

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

That this Council:-

- (a) regrets the phasing out of the Education Services Grant and its impact on schools and the Council;
- (b) notes the analysis by The Education Policy Institute which finds that all schools in England face real terms cuts in funding per pupil, and that half face reductions of between 6% and 11% by 2019-20 under the new National Funding Formula proposed by the Government;
- (c) condemns the Government's choice to spend almost £1 billion on what this Council believes to be an ideological crusade to expand free schools and grammars which will only help the privileged few, whilst elsewhere schools are facing real terms cuts to spending;
- (d) recognises that many of Sheffield's schools are already struggling and that the financial outlook for Sheffield schools is likely to deteriorate as cost pressures increase and funding is cut further;
- (e) calls upon HM Government to increase the schools budget in order to prevent a serious detrimental impact on class sizes, support for pupils with special needs or valuable extra-curricular activities;
- (f) calls upon HM Government to ensure Pupil Premium is protected from these cuts;
- (g) asks the Leader of the Council to write to all Sheffield MPs, urging them to raise the Council's concerns with the Secretary of State for Education; and
- (h) resolves to support a cross-party campaign to raise awareness amongst parents, teaching professionals, governing bodies and teaching unions to urge the Government to reverse these cuts.

## **13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROB MURPHY**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that:-

- (i) Sheffield's air pollution urgently needs to be reduced;
  - (ii) in many parts of Sheffield, especially near busy roads, in the city centre and close to the M1, levels of air pollutants sometimes exceed maximum legal limits;
  - (iii) air pollution impacts on the health of people in our city, especially the most vulnerable, causing permanent lung damage in babies and young children and exacerbating lung and heart disease in older people, and contributing to an estimated 500 premature deaths in Sheffield each year;
  - (iv) other English cities, such as Leeds, Nottingham and Derby, are introducing Clean Air Zones to reduce the level of these pollutants, with support from central government, and that Sheffield is not on this list; and
  - (v) Clean Air Zones received significant public support in the YouGov poll reported in The Guardian newspaper on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2016, in which 76% of respondents supported the implementation of Clean Air Zones to bring their cities' levels of pollution to within European maximum legal limits;
- (b) believes that:-
- (i) it is unfair for Sheffield residents to be left behind breathing polluted air, when other major cities have Clean Air Zones planned;
  - (ii) a Clean Air Zone should be introduced in Sheffield's Air Quality Management Area to ensure Sheffield's air quality is within maximum legal limits by 2020; and
  - (iii) the scale of this public health crisis is such that action on air pollution cannot wait and this Council should immediately take steps locally where we have the power to do so; and
- (c) calls on the Administration to:-
- (i) lobby the appropriate government minister to gain support for a Clean Air Zone in Sheffield;
  - (ii) commit to take steps towards implementing a Clean Air Zone in Sheffield, so that the people of Sheffield are not left breathing polluted air;
  - (iii) commit to the immediate development of a new Sheffield-wide Action Plan to bring air quality within maximum legal limits and replace the 2012 plan, which failed to achieve its

main objectives by its target date of December 2015, with one that will ensure the safety of Sheffield's public;

- (iv) issue public health warnings when air pollution levels are particularly high, so that people can make informed decisions relating to their health;
- (v) immediately take steps deemed to be necessary to help reduce deaths and illnesses linked to polluted air, including but not limited to:-
  - (A) working with Sheffield's major bus and tram providers to make public transport more joined up and affordable;
  - (B) supporting taxis to meet clean emission standards;
  - (C) promoting and incentivising the use of electric vehicles and car clubs, and ensuring that Council vehicles are electric where possible; and
  - (D) promoting walking and cycling to work;
- (vi) ensure that work to bring air pollution within safe and legal limits is adequately prioritised as a key public health issue; and
- (vii) report back to the relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on the progress made on these actions by no later than January 2018.

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

That this Council:-

- (a) believes the working poor and their families are under attack and are losing the battle; income has fallen for the poorest due to benefit changes and wage compression; and these issues and related problems are a direct result of "Austerity" policies perpetrated by the current and previous governments, and the poorest in society are now bearing the majority of the cuts, and the Government is shifting its debt onto them, creating more hardship and reducing state services to the neediest in our society;
- (b) notes that, at the same time, the Government is creating an additional £60bn of Quantitative Easing to spend in the financial markets, which makes a total Quantitative Easing package of £435bn to be deployed so far, and wonders what good could have been made of this kind of financial clout for the benefit of society as

a whole;

- (c) regrets that under the current government this theme of the poor getting poorer and the rich getting richer is likely to continue, and believes it is a disgrace that this situation has been allowed to proceed as far as it has;
- (d) asks where is the opposition, and where is the alternative economic policy?;
- (e) condemns the system of planned corporate control, known as "Globalisation", which this Council believes was created by stealth and deception, and is a system that benefits the financial interests of the City of London at the expense of the rest of society;
- (f) believes the UK needs Quantitative Easing for the people, investing in the real economy, helping finance small businesses who still find it difficult to secure funding, and making it easier for small and medium-sized businesses with 250 employees or less to tender for public sector contracts;
- (g) also believes this money could be used to allow young people to start an apprenticeship in place of four non-core subjects at GCSE level, and to abolish tuition fees for those studying science, technology, engineering, maths and medicine;
- (h) further believes a policy of re-nationalising our railways, transport system, utilities and services would, in the future, benefit society as a whole; and
- (i) places on record this Council's belief that, at this moment, we have a system of "Socialism for the Bankers" and "Capitalism for the Workers".

## **15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAGID MAGID**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that:-
  - (i) the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) is a rating system introduced by the Government that grades universities based on how they score on a number of key metrics, and that institutions deemed to have high quality teaching will be permitted to raise their tuition fees beyond the current cap of £9000 a year;
  - (ii) the Teaching Survey 2017 revealed that "UK staff strongly oppose the National Student Survey and the teaching

excellence framework, claiming that the latter will do nothing to improve the status or quality of teaching”; and

(iii) both the University of Sheffield and Sheffield Hallam University have declared they will be taking part in TEF, despite strong opposition from the Students’ Unions at both institutions and from the National Union of Students;

(b) believes that:-

(i) higher education is a public good that benefits society as a whole, and so should be free and accessible to all regardless of their background;

(ii) TEF is a regressive step that will lead to the further marketisation of higher education, turning students into consumers; and

(iii) an alternate model for improving the higher education experience and teaching should be found that works for students, staff, and Sheffield; and

(c) resolves to:-

(i) place on record its opposition to TEF, and to the marketisation of higher education more generally;

(ii) commend the University of Sheffield Students’ Union for their positive and engaging ‘Shef Better Than TEF’ campaign, as a result of which the University of Sheffield has agreed not to raise tuition fees for current students, and further, commend Sheffield Hallam Students’ Union on their hard efforts on raising awareness of TEF and lobbying their University; and

(iii) request that copies of this motion be forwarded to the Vice Chancellors of the University of Sheffield and Sheffield Hallam University, as well as both University Student Unions.



Chief Executive

Dated this 28 day of March 2017

**The next ordinary meeting of the Council will be its Annual General Meeting on 17 May 2017 at the Town Hall. The next ordinary meeting of the Council will be held on 7 June 2017 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 Audit and 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 1 February 2017, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

## PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

- |   |  |    |   |    |  |
|---|--|----|---|----|--|
| 1 | <i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i><br>Andy Nash<br>Bob Pullin<br>Richard Shaw           | 10 | <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i><br>Pauline Andrews<br>Andy Bainbridge            | 19 | <i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i><br>Mohammad Maroof<br>Alison Teal                      |
| 2 | <i>Beighton Ward</i><br>Helen Mirfin-Boukouris<br>Chris Rosling-Josephs<br>Ian Saunders    | 11 | <i>Ecclesall Ward</i><br>Shaffaq Mohammed<br>Paul Scriven                     | 20 | <i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i><br>Julie Dore<br>Ben Miskell<br>Jack Scott                    |
| 3 | <i>Birley Ward</i><br>Bryan Lodge<br>Karen McGowan   | 12 | <i>Firth Park Ward</i><br>Alan Law<br>Abtisam Mohamed<br>Abdul Khayum         | 21 | <i>Richmond Ward</i><br>Mike Drabble<br>Dianne Hurst<br>Peter Rippon                         |
| 4 | <i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i><br>Michelle Cook<br>Kieran Harpham<br>Magid Magid | 13 | <i>Fulwood Ward</i><br>Sue Alston<br>Andrew Sangar<br>Cliff Woodcraft         | 22 | <i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i><br>Dawn Dale<br>Peter Price<br>Garry Weatherall      |
| 5 | <i>Burngreave Ward</i><br>Jackie Drayton<br>Mark Jones<br>Talib Hussain                    | 14 | <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i><br>Lewis Dagnall<br>Cate McDonald<br>Chris Peace | 23 | <i>Southey Ward</i><br>Leigh Bramall<br>Tony Damms<br>Jayne Dunn                             |
| 6 | <i>City Ward</i><br>Douglas Johnson<br>Robert Murphy<br>Moya O'Rourke                      | 15 | <i>Graves Park Ward</i><br>Ian Auckland<br>Steve Ayriss                       | 24 | <i>Stannington Ward</i><br>David Baker<br>Penny Baker<br>Vickie Priestley                    |
| 7 | <i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i><br>Craig Gamble Pugh<br>Adam Hanrahan                  | 16 | <i>Hillsborough Ward</i><br>George Lindars-Hammond<br>Josie Paszek            | 25 | <i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i><br>Jack Clarkson<br>Richard Crowther<br>Keith Davis |
| 8 | <i>Darnall Ward</i><br>Mazher Iqbal<br>Mary Lea<br>Zahira Naz                              | 17 | <i>Manor Castle Ward</i><br>Lisa Banes<br>Terry Fox<br>Pat Midgley            | 26 | <i>Walkley Ward</i><br>Olivia Blake<br>Ben Curran<br>Neale Gibson                            |
| 9 | <i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i><br>Joe Otten<br>Martin Smith                                 | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i><br>David Barker<br>Tony Downing<br>Gail Smith          | 27 | <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i><br>John Booker<br>Adam Hurst                                    |
|   |  |    |   | 28 | <i>Woodhouse Ward</i><br>Mick Rooney<br>Jackie Satur<br>Paul Wood                            |

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Nasima Akther, Sue Auckland, Roger Davison, Colin Ross, Zoe Sykes and Steve Wilson.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 2.1 Personal interests on the item relating to the petition calling on the Council to reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View - Agenda Item 4.(b).1. - were declared by Councillors Adam Hurst, Josie Paszek and Bob Pullin on the grounds that they were appointed by the Council to serve on the Council of Governors of Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust.
- 2.2 Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a disclosable pecuniary interest on the item relating to the petition calling on the Council to reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View - Agenda Item 4.(b).1. - on the grounds that he was a Non-Executive Director of Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust. Councillor Bramall was not present at the meeting for the consideration of the petition.
- 2.3 Councillor David Barker declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 - Notice of Motion regarding Health and Social Care Funding, due to him being employed by an NHS Trust.

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

- 3.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2017 be approved as a true and accurate record.

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

Dorothy Slingsby

The Lord Mayor reported that Dorothy Slingsby, one of the City's Women of Steel, had passed away on Christmas Eve 2016. She was aged 95.

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Regarding the Waste Management Re-Tender Process

The Council received a petition containing 145 signatures regarding the Waste Management re-tender process.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mr Pete Davies, GMB.

Mr Davies explained that the petition asked the Council to reconsider and open up discussions with the GMB to explore the option of in-sourcing the waste management service at this time and as part of the Sheffield waste management re-tender process. He said that the reasons given for not insourcing at this point in time which were contained within Cabinet report on this matter regarding equal pay and reputational damage were not accepted by the GMB.

Mr Davies commented that he did not believe that the Council officers were prepared to explore in-house or third sector options. The petition asked the Council to provide support for an option within the tender process to assist workers should they vote to support a co-operative or third sector bid in the event that the tender process continued.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment. Councillor Lodge stated that the Council had been trying to achieve savings from the integrated waste management contract and had reached a point where the contract was not delivering the best service for the cost. There was nothing in the related Cabinet report which sought to denigrate the workforce. The Council wished to look at what was best for the City. There were a number of options and, on balance, it was considered best to break down the service into its constituent parts so as to increase flexibility.

The call centre would come back into the Council and the Council could take control of the development of the District Energy Network. Whilst there was a wish to in-source the Collection Service, there were time constraints. A seven-year contract would give time to identify changes in working patterns and nothing would be decided without negotiations with the workforce.

With regards to the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF), it had been considered whether the facility could be in-sourced. There were issues regarding volumes and it was not the right point at which to bring the facility back into the Council.

He referred to the example of the Housing Repairs Service which was being brought in house, having previously been provided by Kier. There was work which needed to be done to bring services in-house and that was what the Council wished to aim to do. With regards to the Collection Service, bidders would have to demonstrate what they would do, including the introduction of new ways of working to deliver greater efficiencies and continued safe working practices.

Councillor Lodge stated that there were a number of issues in relation to the integrated waste management contract with regards to which he would be pleased to meet with the petitioners.

#### 4.1.2 Petition Requesting a Rent Rebate for Crystal Peaks Market Traders to Match the Moor Market

The Council received a petition containing 43 signatures, requesting a rent rebate for Crystal Peaks Market traders to match the Moor Market.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Iain Johnson. Mr Johnson stated that there was an issue regarding decreasing footfall at Crystal Peaks Market and he commented that a number of traders were struggling. Some people were going to the Moor Market and it was considered that there was an uneven playing field because traders at the Moor Market received subsidised rent.

He stated that a better plan was required to increase footfall and it was noted that a new manager was to be appointed, whose role would include addressing the issue of footfall. Facilities at Crystal Peaks Market were also inferior to those at the Moor Market. In addition, there were a large number of discount retailers at Crystal Peaks, which were in competition with market traders for customers.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure. Councillor Lea stated that markets were valuable to the City and they had economic and social benefits. Markets created jobs and contributed to the economy. The Moor Market was critical to the City Region. It was located in an outstanding building and footfall was increasing, as was the level of occupancy in the Market. The Council continued to discount rents for traders in the Moor Market as the situation was still fragile. Crystal Peaks Market had high occupancy and high footfall.

Councillor Lea stated that in the context of the financial savings which the Council was required to make, it would be difficult to agree a reduction in rents for traders at Crystal Peaks Market. She confirmed that a new Markets Manager was being recruited and they would consider improvements.

Councillor Lea said that she would be pleased to meet with the traders together with Council Officers to look at the problems and concerns which they had raised.

#### 4.1.3 Petition Requesting the Council to Take Action to Remove all "To Let" Boards in Walkley, Crookes, Broomhill, Hunters Bar and Sharrow

The Council received an electronic petition containing 17 signatures, requesting the Council to take action to remove all "To Let" boards in Walkley, Crookes, Broomhill, Hunters Bar and Sharrow.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Tony Flatley. Mr Flatley stated that in certain parts of the City, there were a large number of privately rented homes and there were a high number of 'To Let' boards. Their use was poorly regulated and the signs were not necessarily used to advertise a property to let but did serve to advertise a company. He said that they had a negative impact on the visual amenity of an area and also contributed to opportunistic burglaries.

The petitioners sought a Regulation 7 Direction from the Secretary of State to remove deemed consent for 'To Let' boards. The petitioners had written to the Secretary of State and had met with a number of local Councillors, who had been supportive in relation to this issue.



The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

4.1.4 Petition Requesting the Council to Take Action to Remove all “To Let” Boards in the Shoreham Street Area

The Council received a petition containing nine signatures, requesting the Council to take action to remove all “To Let” boards in the Shoreham Street area.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

Councillor Iqbal responded to both petitions concerning “To Let” boards. He stated that he could empathise with people and that ward councillors had raised this matter with him. This was classed as advertising under the Town and Country Planning Act 2007. There was a voluntary code by which landlords and agents were expected to remove to let boards once a property had been occupied for 14 days. However, this did not always happen. As regards a Regulation 7 Direction, Council Officers would be looking at this and it would need further consideration. He said that the Council would continue to discuss this issue with Mr Flatley and he hoped that a resolution could be achieved.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that the Council was working with the University of Sheffield and with the private rented sector and the police in connection with the matters that had been raised by the petitions.

4.1.5 Petition Objecting to Potential Council Budget Cuts

The Council received a petition containing 260 signatures and objecting to potential Council budget cuts.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Alistair Tice. Mr Tice stated that he submitted a petition to the Council last February regarding budget cuts and the setting of a no-cuts budget by the Council through the use of reserves and borrowing powers and joining with other local councils with regards to a no cuts strategy. He said that the response at that time had been that reserves were earmarked for specific use and would not be used to avoid cuts. The budget which was then announced took £50 million from reserves to put to the pension fund.

The petition asked the Council to bring about the termination of the waste management contract with Veolia and to bring the service back in house. At the November meeting of Council, Mr Tice said that he had been told that it was not necessarily simple to change the contract but the Council subsequently announced that the contract with Veolia would be terminated and service would

be put out to the market.

Mr Tice also said that the Council should bring the highways service back in house. The Council's medium term financial strategy recognised that it was not possible to balance the Council's budget by a process of 'salami slicing' but that transformative changes were required, akin to NHS funding plans. He questioned whether that would mean the closure or privatisation of council services. Mr Tice referred to the ceasing of the Central Support Grant and use of business rates to fund local authorities. He said that it was time to make a stand against the Government otherwise there would be nothing left by 2020.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. Councillor Curran stated that he agreed with the premise of the petition and he said that austerity had adversely affected people and some people were affected disproportionately. The Council had argued against cuts in funding to local government and also that any reductions in funding should be distributed in a fairer way as it was local authorities in the north of the Country which had borne the greatest impact of the cuts.

Councillor Curran said that the Government had decided not to give the Council as much funding and, at the same time, the Council had a duty to set a legal, balanced budget. The Council's free reserves were at the lowest of any of the Core Cities as a percentage and in cash terms. Some reserves needed to be kept for future events, such as the flooding which occurred in 2007. Some reserves were earmarked for a particular purpose. There had been a shortfall in the pension fund and the Council had to decide whether to fund that shortfall from revenue budget or reserves and it was decided to use reserves in order to not have short term cuts.

He said that, theoretically, the Council could use reserves but, a consequence of the Council not balancing the budget in future might be that the Government may take over running of the Council. Sometimes, the Council used funding to invest in services to save money in the longer term. This might include early intervention services to prevent costs downstream. In relation to borrowing and prudential borrowing in particular, there was a revenue cost to pay back borrowing which made this expensive and something which did not work effectively. The Council would continue to lobby the Government and fight for a better deal for Sheffield.

Council Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, stated that with regard to the waste management contract, there would be costs regarding the proposals and these were included in the information considered by the Cabinet. He said that he was confident that the approach being taken with regard to the contract would deliver savings. It was the Council's aim to bring the waste management service in house but this could not be achieved immediately, as was demonstrated with the time taken in bringing the Housing Repairs Service back in house. The Council was looking to bring services back in house where this was appropriate and possible and such proposals needed to be worked through and the implications understood.

4.1.6 Petition Objecting to the Withdrawal of Grant Aid Funding to the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield (MHAGS)

The Council received a petition containing 1,329 signatures objecting to the withdrawal of grant aid funding to the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Tim Jones who stated that MHAGS was a user led organisation supporting people with mental health issues, which received a small grant of £10K. Some £3.5K of this money went back to the Council towards the cost of rent. A meeting which had been organised with the Cabinet Members for Community Services and Libraries and Finance and Resources had not gone ahead.

Issues such as the benefits system caused problems for people with mental health issues. MHAGS was there to support people who were vulnerable and otherwise would not be able to cope. Those people needed the Council's empathy and support. However, he said that the dedicated services provided by the organisation would be put at risk if the grant of £10K was removed.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries. Councillor Scott said that a petition had previously been submitted to Council concerning funding for MHAGS. He said that he recognised the excellent work which was done by MHAGS with people who had mental health needs. As regards funding, a one year grant had been approved from April 2016 to the end of March 2017. He said that he hoped that MHAGS would apply for funding for the forthcoming financial year. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources was due to meet with representatives from MHAGS soon.

Councillor Scott said that he anticipated an excellent application for funding from MHAGS. At the same time, every organisation which supported vulnerable people deserved a level playing field as regards the grant funding process and it would not be right for a decision to be made at this meeting with regards funding for MHAGS. Councillor Scott confirmed that MHAGS would not be charged rent for the premises it used from April 2017. He said that he would look forward to meeting with representatives of MHAGS and to receiving an application for grant funding from them.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning USA Executive Order Regarding Travel Restrictions

Nigel Slack referred to the introduction of US President Trump's Executive Order banning travellers from Muslim countries and all refugees from entering the USA. He asked whether the Council would write to the Prime Minister to express the Administration's disgust at what he said was a racist, Islamophobic, inflammatory and politically opportunist decision that offends the principles of our Human Rights Act; will they urge the opposition parties (on the Council) to

support this letter and allow their leaders to append their signatures; and will they also urge the Prime Minister to withdraw the invitation of a 'State Visit', as currently requested by more than 1.7 million members of the public, including more than 17,000 from this City?

Mr Slack said that he had been encouraged by the sheer size of the peaceful anti-Trump protest outside the Town Hall on Monday and gratified to see the support voiced by so many Cabinet and other Members on social media. He said that he was also encouraged that, despite blocking Pinstone Street and preventing the Bus companies from conducting their lawful business, no arrests were made using the Trade Union laws. He asked whether the Council would join him in applauding the Police for putting Human Rights before corporate profits.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, thanked Mr Slack for his questions and stated that the matter of US travel ban had been discussed at meetings of her own Group on the Council and at which had been decided that it wished to express its deepest concerns to the Prime Minister. She said that she also hoped that she spoke for all other Councillors. President Trump had made his position clear during the US election campaign and in the way he carried out business and actions of the people around him and therefore, the Executive Order was not surprising. Councillor Dore said that she would be writing a letter to the Prime Minister and would circulate the draft to the Leaders of other groups on the Council so that an appropriate form of words could be found.

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Deputy Leader of the Council, said that he thanked the Councillors that attended the rally to which Mr Slack had referred. He believed that everyone had spoken well and remarked that this was a large gathering outside of the Town Hall. The Prime Minister had a responsibility to send a signal in relation to the actions of the US President. This matter also had implications for the Muslim community in the UK. As regards the policing of the event, he said that he would not intervene in what the police did or did not do. The event was a positive one.

Councillor Dore also made reference to racist comments which had been made to a member of the Council as she left her home. She said that this was clearly not acceptable and this type of behaviour would be challenged.

#### 4.2.2 Public Question Concerning War Memorial Trees Working Group

Nigel Slack stated that, having been present at the Economic & Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017 and seeing Members arguing whether the Western Road War Memorial Trees working group should or should not talk about trees, whilst responding to the petition debate calling for the trees to be saved, would the Council provide more explicit guidance for the group on the issues they are charged with investigating?

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for the Environment, stated that the petition referred to the memorial, which comprised an avenue of trees and the memorial tablet and the Council was looking at how the memorial could be

maintained. There were variations as to the dates on which some trees had been planted and some trees that had been removed in the past had not been replaced. The Council wished to see the memorial maintained for the future and the Scrutiny Working Group had been tasked with considering the issue and putting forward recommendations.

#### 4.2.3 Public Question Concerning Safety of Public Sector Employees

Adam Butcher asked how the Council would ensure that people working in the public sector were protected then carrying out their duties following the attack which occurred in Western Park in January.

Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded to the question and commented that the incident which had been reported in Western Park was a horrific attack although the victim was not a Council employee. Health and Safety for Council employees was taken seriously and risk assessments were carried out and there was also a policy regarding violence at work. If an incident occurred, there would be a review and learning from that event. The Council had a policy and procedure relating to lone working and a health and safety e-learning module was provided to employees. A health and safety committee was established, which included Council officers and trades unions and specific matters could be considered and policies reviewed at those meetings. Councillor Curran explained that he also chaired meetings of the Corporate Joint Committee which considered matters of dispute. The Council had a good track record with regard to health and safety matters.

#### 4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Children's Centres

Mike Levery made reference to the information provided in the call for views on the change to Family Centres from Children's Centres and concerning the location of a Family Centre in each of the City's seven locality areas. He asked how other areas would be covered, for example Chapelton, High Green, Burncross and Grenoside; will the Children's Centres which do not become Family Centres retain their Children's Centre status as defined under the Childcare Act 2006 and continue to be subject to Ofsted inspection; and what was a Linked Centre and how did it differ from a Children's Centre? Mr Levery also requested a written response to his question.

Alan Hooper stated that, in the information provided in relation to the changes to Family Centres from Children's Centres; it stated that the views of people most affected by the proposals were being sought. He asked how parents and carers and local communities were informed of the consultation; if the statistics on attendance at each of the drop in sessions would be published; and why the quarterly What's On was no longer being published at each of the Children's Centres.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded to the question. She said that the question raised would help her to address the issue of information which had been circulating regarding the Family Centres and in particular regard to Angram Bank Children's

Centre. There were 16 Children's Centres areas in the City, each of which was inspected by Ofsted. The Council was consulting on proposals to align the Children's Centre areas with the seven locality areas, rename Children's Centre areas to become Family Centres and widen the age range from 0 to 19 years old or to 25 years for young people with a disability. There would be seven Family Centres and each of the services which those provided would be subject to Ofsted inspection. Parson Cross/Ecclesfield was one of the named locality areas. She said that none of the Children's Centres would be closed but that some would be Linked Centres and some Family Centres. A linked Centre may also be a Children's Centre and the services provided there would continue and it might also provide outreach services. The proposals also tied into emotional and mental health and wellbeing work with young people and the emphasis upon prevention and early intervention.

Councillor Drayton said that she would provide written responses to Mr Levery. She confirmed that the Family Centres would continue to be inspected by Ofsted and be part of that inspection framework. Consultation included parents and carers, local communities, Children's Centre staff and stakeholders, voluntary and community sector organisations, local councillors; and partners which shared Children's Centres.

Various local media had been used to provide information and with regard to the consultation, including social media, a consultation website, an online questionnaire and consultation sessions in local areas. The attendances at drop in sessions would be published. The quarterly 'What's On' was no longer being published. However, the information was part of the Sheffield Directory and social media was being used instead, which was more up to date and cost less. There was also awareness that not everybody could access information on line or had access to social media and therefore information was provided in nurseries, schools and Children's Centres. The outcomes of the consultation on this matter would be considered by a Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee prior to being submitted to Cabinet.

Councillor Drayton said that she was disappointed that a leaflet had been produced concerning Angram Bank. There would not be closure of any Centres in this consultation. Parents were understandably worried and concerned about this. Angram Bank would probably get more services as a result of the changes proposed. She considered this to be good news for families in Sheffield.

#### 4.2.5 Public Question Concerning the Housing and Planning Act

Carrie Hedderwick referred to the Housing and Planning Act and stated that she had previously requested the Council to join with her to oppose the Act and she had written to the Cabinet Member for Housing regarding the possibility of a joint statement. She made reference to the Housing Revenue Account item on the agenda for this meeting of the Council and to that fact that the Council had issued factual information to tenants.

She asked whether the Council would be prepared to issue a statement

regarding its opposition to the Housing and Planning Act, which did not address the housing crisis in the Country.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, stated that the Government was yet to publish the planning element of the changes brought about by the Act.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that the In Touch magazine was not political and the Council could not publish any content in the magazine which was not factual. The Council did not yet have the fine detail regarding fixed term tenancies. She said that a statement could be issued but that first, she would need to know detail and exactly what the implications were for Sheffield.

#### 4.2.6 Public Question Concerning Mental Health Action Group Sheffield (MHAGS)

Stuart Warren asked about the future of Mental Health Action Group Sheffield and told Members what a positive effect the Group had on his life and said he was very concerned about what would happen if it was to close.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, thanked Mr Warren for his question and for sharing his experiences about how important MHAGS was to him. He said that he hoped stories like his were reflected in the application which MHAGS submitted for funding as it demonstrated the difference that the Group made. He said that it would not be appropriate for him to comment on the funding for MHAGS at this meeting but he did look forward to receiving an application from them.

#### 4.2.7 Public Questions Concerning Hurlfield View

Stella Garnham asked how much consultation had happened with the people that relied upon services which Hurlfield View provided and stated that there were some family carers and service users who had not been consulted in any form.

Garry Jackson stated that organised and planned respite was a lifeline for family carers and if this was taken away, their mental health and wellbeing would be affected. He said this would impact on a family carer's ability to care for their loved one at home and he asked what would happen then.

Susan Conlan stated that Sheffield had a strategy for maintaining care in the community for as long as possible. She asked whether closing the only facility that offered planned respite and day care went against the Council's own strategic aims.

Alison Wood stated that Hurlfield View was used by the Rapid Response Team when people were in crisis and sadly this facility was used frequently. She asked how this service would be provided in the future.

Lee Pearse asked how dispersing dementia care across the City could be as

high a level of service as was provided at Hurlfield View. He also asked what would happen to service users that the private sector refused to take.

Dawn Millington said that it had been stated that the closure of Hurlfield View was not a cost saving exercise. She asked why the Council was ceasing a specialist service where quality and expertise was delivered to meet the needs of individuals with dementia with complex and often challenging needs. The proposal was to deliver services by purchasing beds in private homes around Sheffield and, although this might provide adequate care to people with mild to moderate dementia, it would not manage complex needs in the same way as Hurlfield View without the necessary expertise, staff ratio or bed availability.

She challenged the Council's assertion that people did not want one facility, based in one area and said that the chances of accessing a bed in a facility which was local to someone would be challenging. Concerns had also been expressed regarding availability of a suitable place for anyone who is blocking a bed or in a crisis situation.

Dementia was on the increase and there was no cure and it would be a mistake not to deliver specialist dementia services at Hurlfield View. It would impact upon other issues including hospital admissions, abuse cases and family/carer breakdowns. She asked how the Council would identify issues and undertake monitoring when Hurlfield View closed and the service was being delivered differently.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded to the questions. She stated that the Council had liaised with the Health and Social Care Trust to obtain information about the current users of Hurlfield View and over 200 letters had been sent and meetings had been held including in Stocksbridge. A helpline had been set up, staff had spoken with people in person and a consultation survey had been conducted by post and online. Councillor McDonald said that she would be concerned if there were people who had not been included in the consultation. She asked for people asking questions to let her have the details of those people who it was thought had not been included and she would address that.

Councillor McDonald said that she agreed that respite care was a lifeline for families and carers and affirmed that those services would not cease as the Council had found alternative services which would provide high quality services and with expertise in supporting people with dementia. She also agreed that it was important to maintain care for people in the community for as long as possible.

The Council wished to see a wider range of provision as part of the re-provision of services. Alternative provision had been procured for the rapid response service. There were a number of independent sector providers in Sheffield which could provide services for people with complex needs.

Services would be regulated and inspected by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and Councillor McDonald stated that she had visited providers. As



regards the monitoring of incidents and falls, providers were required to have robust procedures and that would continue to be monitored.

#### 4.3 Petition Requiring Debate

##### 4.3.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Save Hurlfield View Day Centre from Closure

The Council received an electronic petition containing 9,954 signatures, requesting the Council to save Hurlfield View Day Centre from closure.

The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at a Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying e-petition was as follows:-

*"Hurlfield View is the only facility in Sheffield that has day services and respite care for severely challenging individuals with dementia, the most complex cases in Sheffield."*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sue Harding who stated that she had been a carer for many years and represented users and carers of Hurlfield View. The facility meant a lot to people, including carers who contributed to people's care by saving significant amount of money each year in relation to the cost of health and social care.

Sue Harding said that, although there had been consultation in relation to the proposals for dementia care, not enough people were consulted during that time. It was acknowledged that value for money was important and there was a context of cuts to council funding, which was not the fault of the Council. However, service users with dementia often failed in private health care and hospitals, whereas they thrived in specialised provision like that provided at Hurlfield View. It would cost a lot of money to place a person in alternative provision to Hurlfield View. It cost approximately £500 a week to keep someone at Hurlfield View, whereas it was £400 a day to keep someone in an NHS hospital bed. 85 percent of admissions to Hurlfield View were for people in crisis, be it the person suffering from dementia or the carer and people were able to return home owing to the skill and professionalism of the people working at Hurlfield View.

It would be difficult for people to navigate the many other providers of dementia care. Reference was made to the plans and aspirations of other providers, although it was hoped that these did not translate into service cuts. Carers wanted continuity, routine and long term support and despite the Council's plans etc., it seemed as if the strategy was broken.

The petitioners asked the Council to take a step back regarding the closure of Hurlfield View and to work with other organisations in the City to present a cohesive strategy for Sheffield using the financial resources available. She asked the Council not to close Hurlfield View.

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

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, thanked the petitioners and Sue Harding for presenting the petition to Council. She said that she was sympathetic to the concerns which people had expressed and with regard to their experiences of supporting a loved one with dementia and people's attachment to Hurlfield View. She wished to reassure people, families and carers and said that dementia services were a priority for the Council and everyone would continue to receive services. This was not a cost cutting exercise and the Council was reinvesting in dementia services.

Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust had informed the Council that it could no longer provide services at Hurlfield View Resource Centre within the budget provided to it. The changes to provision would not be happening at this time except that the Trust had said it would cease to provide services at Hurlfield View.

The Council was providing dedicated staff to work with individuals and their family carers to ensure that alternative arrangements were identified. The tender process had been completed and there would be communication about the changes.

Included in the tender, there would be 12 beds for short term and planned respite care available per week across the City and there would also be dementia day support. All of the providers were rated 'good' by the Care Quality Commission, which was the same rating as for Hurlfield View. There would be a budget available for additional respite care.

Councillor McDonald said that she the utmost respect for the work which was done by the staff at Hurlfield View.

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

Members gave personal accounts of family members and friends who were dementia sufferers and the experience of those that cared for them.

It was suggested that the decision regarding Hurlfield View was reconsidered by Cabinet with a view to maintaining the high quality provision during the transitional period to a new structure.

Reference was made to an involvement exercise, which had been undertaken in 2012 with people who suffered from dementia and their carers, which had considered how communities could better understand people's needs and provide support and how change could be made which also protected existing users. The process had found that people wanted a community of carers and help them to carry on their lives in the normal way for as long as possible.

People wanted help and support early to avoid crisis and which was locally based and the Council also wished to provide community based services for people sooner.

For some people suffering with the most challenging forms of dementia, moderate types of care provision would not be appropriate to their needs. Hurlfield View had been improved in 2012 because it provided care of a specialist nature. The number of people requiring support was likely to increase. It was thought that this matter should be considered again by Cabinet.

This was a difficult decision for the Council and Health and Social Care Trust. The Impact assessment stated that the change would be a positive change, but with reduced beds and places, it appeared to be a cut in services. This would have an impact on people using the service at present. It was suggested that the matter was referred to a Scrutiny Committee in order that there could be examination of what providers, including the Health and Social Care Trust, could offer and what the impact would be.

Cases of Dementia were increasing and it was important that respite was available for carers and families. Hurlfield View had received a 'good' rating from the Care Quality Commission and had received praise for the services provided there and such provision should be supported.

It was unfortunate that the Health and Social Care Trust was not to continue with the provision of services at Hurlfield View one year into a three year contract. The Council had looked at options and had asked questions about the issue. There would not be a gap in service provision for people and there was an individual plan for every user and carer. The changes were not intended to save money. There would be extra capacity for day support and services closer to people's homes. The CQC had inspected providers which were to be used and had rated them as 'good'.

A centre providing specialist care was needed together with a rapid response team in cases where a situation at home had broken down. There were talented members of staff that would lose their jobs and there was concern about the training and standards of care which were to be provided to people. The service provided at Hurlfield was what service users and carers wanted. Nonetheless, it was also understood that there was considerable pressure on social care.

People wished to have respite which was close to their homes and reference was made to a Notice of Motion on the Summons for this meeting concerning funding for social care. There was reliance on carers and especially in relation to dementia and it was important to make sure there was respite available for them. The Council needed to work with carers and make sure their concerns were addressed. Sometimes, families regarded staff in care settings as friends and family and breaking up that relationship would potentially cause distress.

Some care homes could provide care for dementia support but others were not able to do so. It might be difficult to provide a bed at short notice. Hurlfield View was an important asset with well trained staff. Assurance was needed with

regard to the provision of beds and it was acknowledged that the Cabinet Member would contact people that had not been involved in the consultation relating to Hurlfield View.

The lead petitioner, Sue Harding, exercised a right of reply. Said that she did not intend to apportion blame. There were 16 beds available at Hurlfield View and more, not less beds were needed. There were 5000 people in the City suffering from dementia and one out of 20 needed the services of the type provided at Hurlfield View. Other residential care was also needed and people wanted quality rather than proximity to their homes. She said that the private sector did not necessarily know how to cope with people with conditions such as the service users at Hurlfield View.

She said that nobody wanted Hurlfield View to close and the Council was asked to look elsewhere for the funding and not to close Hurlfield View.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She commented that the petitioners were sincere in their concerns about the issue of dementia care and Hurlfield View. She clarified that the Council had procured 12 beds for short term/planned respite care available per week and 4 beds available per week for short term care for the provision of emergency/unplanned admissions. In addition, there would be an additional budget for respite, for those people who needed such provision. The Council was certainly not seeking a low quality or generic service. It was to work with specialist providers which were registered with the Care Quality Commission and comply with the standards associated with specialist dementia provision as well as having skilled members of staff.

The Council had listened carefully to people and it was important that the Council acted in the best interests of services users, families and carers and so that provision was in place for people with dementia.

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

### **Proposal 1**

It was moved by Councillor Cate McDonald, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to “reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View”, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care to check that appropriate consultation has been undertaken on the matter and to monitor the delivery of the alternative provision which has been commissioned.

### **Alternative Proposal 2**

It was moved by Councillor Bob Pullin, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to “reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View”, and refers the petition to the Cabinet for reconsideration.

On being put to the vote, alternative proposal 2 was not carried.

The votes on alternative proposal 2 were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For alternative proposal 2 (25) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.

Against alternative proposal 2 (48) - Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on alternative proposal 2 (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

Proposal 1 was then put to the vote and carried as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to “reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View”, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care to check that appropriate consultation has been undertaken on the matter and to monitor the delivery of the alternative provision which has been commissioned.
--

(NOTE: Councillor Leigh Bramall, having earlier declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the above item, was not present for the duration of the item.)

4.4 Public Questions

4.4.1 Public Questions Concerning Highways Trees

Colin Carr stated that campaigners had to resort to Freedom of information requests, internal reviews and the Information Commissioner to get an admission from the Council that Flexi Pave had never been used in the Streets Ahead project to save mature, healthy, highway trees. He said that the Cabinet Member for Environment had stated at the Council meeting of 7 December 2016 that it had not been demonstrated to him that Flexi Pave could be used safely with raised roots and said that he would be meeting with representatives of Flexi Pave to obtain this assurance. Mr Carr said that such a reassurance could have been obtained at the start of the Streets Ahead contract from Amey as the Operations Manager for Amey was the contact for Flexi Pave when it was successfully used in Birmingham. Mr Carr asked whether the Cabinet Member had met with representatives of Flexi Pave and if so, what the outcome of the meeting was.

Helen McIlroy referred to the Western Road War Memorial and the Working Group of the Scrutiny Committee which had been established to look at the issue. She asked whether particular councillors would be able to maintain a neutral stance on the issue, given what she said was their antipathy to the campaign to save Sheffield's healthy street trees and whether other more neutral Members should take their places instead.

Dave Dilner asked why the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee was being allowed to change the wording and aim of a petition regarding the 23 trees on Western Road in the Scrutiny process.

Justin Buxton asked whether the Cabinet Member or the Council could provide a list of people with access to Schedule 2 of the Streets Ahead contract. Secondly, he asked for confirmation of a statement regarding the use of alternative engineering solutions to retain street trees. Thirdly, Mr Buxton asked a question about the use of Flexi Pave and for the documentary evidence that it had been used.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to the questions. He said that he had not yet met with representatives of Flexi Pave but that this meeting was being arranged and he was looking forward to meeting with them. Councillor Lodge said that he was aware of the use of Flexi Pave elsewhere and said that assurance was needed regarding its use on pavements and in dealing with roots. He said he would be pleased to discuss the outcomes of the meeting with Flexi Pave and more generally, the Council would provide information for people and would wish to talk with people about these issues.

With regard to the question concerning comments made by Councillors Wilson and Gibson, Councillor Lodge said that he was confident that Councillors were subject to the Members' Code of Conduct and would conduct themselves appropriately.

Councillor Lodge said that the Council assessed the information which was put forward. However, there was some misinformation in the public domain and the Council was attempting to dispel myths. For example, just over 6,000 trees were to be replaced over the core investment period. As regards the Working Group of the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Scrutiny concerning the Western Road Memorial, Members were subject to the Code of Conduct and they would consider the information that was put before them.

The petition referred to trees and the memorial and he had said that the Council should ensure that the memorial was maintained. Age assessments of the trees had been communicated and it had been confirmed that some trees post-date others. Other trees had been replaced over the years and 26 trees had been removed in the past and had not been replaced. The Memorial comprised the avenue of trees and the stone tablet. The referral by Council to the Scrutiny Committee was clear that the trees and stone tablet should be preserved as a memorial. The terms of reference for the Working Group would be discussed at the meeting of the Working Group on 2 February.

In response to the matters raised by Mr Buxton, Councillor Lodge said that he would provide a written response as these were technical points. As regards Schedule 2 of the contract and the method statement, Councillor Lodge stated that he had had discussions about the outputs of the contract, monitoring and access to parts of the contract which had not been redacted. He asked Mr Buxton to inform him of the specific parts of the contract to which he was referring and he would provide a written answer.

Flexi Pave was a trade name and that product had not been used as part of the Streets Ahead contract. Flexible paving was a terminology and solutions of that type had been used.

#### 4.5 Petition Requiring Debate

##### 4.5.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 6,186 signatures, requesting the Council to save trees on Rivelin Valley Road.

The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at a Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying paper and e-petition was as follows:-

*"We, the undersigned, refute the assertion that the felling of 31 trees on Rivelin Valley Road, Sheffield is necessary. This road is the second longest avenue of Lime trees in the UK and is an invaluable asset to Sheffield and its heritage. We demand, and believe it imperative, that sensitive, alternative highway engineering specifications for footway, kerb and drain be adopted and implemented to enable the long-term retention of these trees."*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Rebecca Hammond. She stated that the Rivelin Valley Road was built in 1906 and was the second longest avenue of Lime trees in the UK. 31 Lime trees were listed for felling and most of those trees were situated near to the fire station and the park and therefore their removal would have a definite visual impact. The area was important habitat for bees and other wildlife. She said that alternative engineering solutions were included in the Streets Ahead contract and this could be done at no additional cost, so could not the Council mandate the use of these alternatives. The petition represented people from every postal code district in the City and people valued street trees. She said that the trees on Rivelin Valley Road were special, but not more so than any other trees in Sheffield.

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

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to the petition. He said that there had been previous petitions and debates concerning street trees and that the number of signatories to the petition was acknowledged by the Council. The Council had responsibilities for people across the City and Members did care about the people that they represented, although constituents and elected Members may not necessarily always agree with each other.

Councillor Lodge stated that, as regards Rivelin Valley Road, 700 trees had been planted originally and 527 trees were reviewed. 36 trees were affected, including 8 which were classified as dangerous, 4 of which were dead, 2 dying and 2 decaying. Of the 36 trees, 21 were found to be damaging the road or pavement. The trees had been assessed by an Arboriculturalist and highways engineer. Whilst he understood that people might question decisions which had been made with regards to trees, there was in some cases misinformation and sometimes the expertise and knowledge of people working on the Streets Ahead programme was criticised. 56 properties were surveyed and 6 responses were made, 3 of which disagreed with the proposals regarding the trees on Rivelin Valley Road. The matter was therefore referred to the Independent Tree Panel in March 2016 and the Panel would consider the matter. A number of engineering solutions had been used at other locations in the City, although it had not been stated as a matter of public record where such engineering solutions had been used. Councillor Lodge said that officers had been requested to make this information available.

The Tree Panel would suggest options with regards to the trees on Rivelin Valley Road and the Council would consider those options to see whether they were reasonable and viable. He commented that financial resources were restrictive. The contract specification was put together, beginning in 2006 to 2009 and documentation was collated and sent to prospective bidders for the tender.

Councillor Lodge acknowledged that this was an emotive issue for people and that there was a process of review and consultation regarding Rivelin Valley



Road. At this point in time, the matter was with the Independent Tree Panel. He said that he would request that officers ask the Tree Panel for an indication of when it would be able to provide the results of its deliberations regarding Rivelin Valley Road. When the results were known, the Council would consider all the options that were available.

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

Would the Council listen and consider alternative engineering solutions rather than continue to apply narrow criteria in relation to street trees. The 700 trees on Rivelin Valley Road had been planted in 1906 and the area was an important part of the City. The proposals included the replacement of a number of trees and to ensure there would be a continuing legacy and an avenue of Lime Trees. The trees should not be removed unless there was a real need. Information with regard to the outcomes of the Independent Tree Panel would be published.

Reference was made to financial penalties if core investment work of the Streets Ahead programme was not completed within time. It was questioned why the Tree Panel had been established in these circumstances as few decisions regarding the proposed felling of street trees had been changed by the Panel. People were not assured that the Tree Panel would report in plenty of time. The Council was urged to look at the options available with regard to maintaining the trees on Rivelin Valley Road.

The Rivelin Valley was a beautiful area and one which families could enjoy. Safe use of the highway needed to be considered, including for cyclists and in relation to parking. It was recognised that some trees may need to be felled but there also needed to be trust in the process which was applied. More trees would be planted than were to be removed.

Reference was made to similar work undertaken by Amey in Birmingham, where trees had been maintained as part of a highways maintenance programme. The Independent Tree Panel was established following the call of action by petitioners, in order to give an independent view to confirm or ascertain whether proposals could be applied or whether there were other options. The contract, which was a Private Finance Initiative (PFI), was inherited and was the only option at that time. Where possible, the contract would be renegotiated. Discussions had been held with the Sheffield Trees Action Group and proposals had been put forward by them and by the Council. The Action Group has asked for information and that would be provided to them.

The lead petitioner, Rebecca Hammond, exercised a right of reply. She said that issues raised relating to parking and cyclists were not applicable in the area of Rivelin Valley Road which was affected. There was Department for Transport guidance relating to highways infrastructure and a straight kerb line was not mandatory and reduced surface regularity may be acceptable. She said that the Woodlands Trust, while supportive of the Council's tree planting initiative, was critical of the programme relating to street trees. Members were asked to look at

the diagram relating to urban trees, which had been circulated, for information. She said that this was about valuing street trees as multi-faceted assets.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He said that trees would be there for the future. The contract was approved by Members in 2008 and there was a large amount to detail contained within it. If Amey was not able to achieve the works which were part of the core investment, as part of the Streets Ahead programme, there would be financial penalties. Councillor Lodge reasserted that the matter of trees on Rivelin Valley Road was with the Independent Tree Panel for its consideration and suggested that the outcome of the Panel's deliberations was awaited.

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

### **Proposal 1**

It was moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that this Council notes the petition entitled "Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road", and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Environment to consider in conjunction with the advice awaited from the Independent Tree Panel in relation to those trees.

### **Alternative Proposal 2**

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council notes the petition entitled "Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road", and refers the petition to the Cabinet to consider changing the policy with regard to the Streets Ahead programme, as relates to these street trees.

On being put to the vote, alternative proposal 2 was not carried.

Proposal 1 was then put to the vote and carried as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition entitled "Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road", and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Environment to consider in conjunction with the advice awaited from the Independent Tree Panel in relation to those trees.

## **5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

- 5.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.
- 5.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4), questions relating to urgent business (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6ii) and questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the

provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5) after four hours and 30 minutes duration.

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

6.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Boards, etc:-

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Monitoring and Advisory Board (Adult Services) | - | Councillors Pauline Andrews and Douglas Johnson to be appointed as additional members of the Board |
| South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority        | - | Councillor Mick Rooney to replace Councillor Nasima Akther   |
| South Yorkshire Pensions Authority             | - | Councillor Ben Curran to replace Councillor Mazher Iqbal   |

(NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted against the appointment relating to the South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority, and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **7. AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16**

7.1 The Council received an Annual Report of the former Audit Committee which provided an overview of its activity during the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

7.2 RESOLVED: That the 2015/16 Annual Report of the former Audit Committee be noted.

## **8. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN & HRA BUDGET 2017-18**

8.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Karen McGowan, that:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2017/18 as set out in appendix A to the report is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2017/18 as set out in appendix B to the report is approved;

- (c) rents for council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2017 in line with the requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) from 2017/18, garage rents will change to a single rate for garage plots and a single rate for garage sites; once implemented this will apply to new garage tenants immediately and to existing garage tenants once improvements have been made to existing sites and plots;
- (e) the community heating unit charge for tenants who receive metered heating is reduced by 10% from April 2017; community heating charges for those tenants receiving unmetered heating will remain unchanged from April 2017;
- (f) following the review of sheltered housing service charges in 2015, as approved by the Cabinet Member for Housing, and work undertaken on future charging for communal heating in sheltered schemes, as reported to the Cabinet Member, the existing weekly charge of £14.89 will be amended to £15.54 to recover the cost for communal heating in sheltered schemes;
- (g) burglar alarm charges are to remain unchanged from April 2017; and
- (h) charges for furnished accommodation are to remain unchanged from April 2017.

8.2 (NOTE: The final paragraph (paragraph i) of the recommendations made by Cabinet, as set out in the agenda papers published for this Council meeting, was withdrawn from consideration on the grounds that it was included in the agenda in error, having not been approved at the Cabinet meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017.)

## **9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ADAM HURST**

### **Child Poverty**

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Adam Hurst, and formally seconded by Councillor Zahira Naz, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent publication of analysis by the Trade Union Congress (TUC), from Office for National Statistics (ONS) figures, finding that the proportion of household debt is at its highest level for five years; on average UK homes owed 26.5% of their annual income to loans and credit cards in the third quarter of 2015, the highest rate since 2008; and the average amount owed by households is now £12,887, the highest figure recorded, and the calculations do not include mortgages;
- (b) is concerned by the need for households to be relying on such high levels of debt, demonstrating that the Government's handling of the national

economy is fundamentally flawed – with average earnings falling below 2% since October - as increases in earning slow, household debt increases and this situation could have serious detrimental long term consequences for raising families out of poverty;

- (c) recalls the findings in July 2015, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) which found that 63% of children living in poverty were in working families in 2013/14 (compared with 54% in 2009/10); and regrets that in the last year, according to the IFS, child poverty has increased by over 200,000 and notes further reports by the IFS which suggest that the UK is set for the biggest increase in child poverty in a generation and that by 2020 child poverty will have risen by 50%;
- (d) wishes to further highlight that the cycle between debt and poverty is well known, and that for children in debt-ridden families, they are more likely to be locked into a cycle of poverty; the Children's charity Barnardo's states that "poverty is the single greatest threat to the wellbeing of children and families";
- (e) reiterates the motion passed at December's Full Council meeting, which noted that Sheffield Brightside and Hillsborough has the 14th highest levels of child poverty of any constituency in the country with 39.7% of children (11,706 children) living in poverty and in Sheffield Central 34.9% of children (5,452 children) are living in poverty;
- (f) believes it is outrageous that in the fifth richest country in the world [i.e. the UK] children are increasingly having to suffer the consequences of poverty, and notes that from the beginning of the Coalition Government in 2010, children's charities have been warning that the Government's policies would result in increased child poverty and this has been seen through the significant growth in foodbanks in recent years;
- (g) regrets that the changes to Universal Credit announced in the Autumn Statement do not address the huge cuts made by this Government and recalls that the cuts to Universal Credit introduced by this Government have taken £2,100 per year from 2.5 million working families today and the measures in the Autumn Statement will give them back as little as £150;
- (h) notes research from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which highlights that lone parents with 2 children, working full time on the National Living Wage, have lost £2,586 per year due to changes in benefits since 2015; and
- (i) welcomes Labour's proposal to reverse cuts to Universal Credit Work Allowances, to restore the important principle abandoned by this Government that work will always pay.

9.2 Whereupon it was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, as an amendment, that the Motion now

submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-

(c) recalls the findings in July 2015, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) in the report "Living Standards, Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2015", which found that "Income inequality has fallen back to levels last seen one or two decades ago, depending on the measure. Relative poverty is lower than before the recession, ..." and that more recently "There was also no significant change in absolute or relative poverty for any of the major demographic groups (children, pensioners and working-age adults without children). ... Key factors acting to hold child poverty down in 2013–14 were employment increases, falls in poverty among workless lone-parent families and falls in poverty among children of self-employed parents.";

2. the deletion, in paragraph (f), of all the words after the words "consequences of poverty";

3. the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraph (h) as a new paragraph (i):-

(h) notes that many of the harshest cuts made by this Government, including cuts to Universal Credit, were blocked during the last Parliament by the Liberal Democrats;

4. the deletion of the original paragraph (i).

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

9.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-

(j) welcomes the Green Party's support for the principle of a universal basic income, which ensures that work will always pay and also addresses the unacceptable hardship of poverty, and looks forward to the results of pilot programmes in Finland, Glasgow and Fife.

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

9.6 It was then formally moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, and formally seconded by Councillor Lisa Banes, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-

(j) supports the Private Member's Bill tabled by Dan Jarvis MP, which will receive its second reading in Parliament on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> February, and the related campaign to end child poverty; and this week's subsequent national Labour Party campaign in support of this.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent publication of analysis by the Trade Union Congress (TUC), from Office for National Statistics (ONS) figures, finding that the proportion of household debt is at its highest level for five years; on average UK homes owed 26.5% of their annual income to loans and credit cards in the third quarter of 2015, the highest rate since 2008; and the average amount owed by households is now £12,887, the highest figure recorded, and the calculations do not include mortgages;
- (b) is concerned by the need for households to be relying on such high levels of debt, demonstrating that the Government's handling of the national economy is fundamentally flawed – with average earnings falling below 2% since October - as increases in earning slow, household debt increases and this situation could have serious detrimental long term consequences for raising families out of poverty;
- (c) recalls the findings in July 2015, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) which found that 63% of children living in poverty were in working families in 2013/14 (compared with 54% in 2009/10); and regrets that in the last year, according to the IFS, child poverty has increased by over 200,000 and notes further reports by the IFS which suggest that the UK is set for the biggest increase in child poverty in a generation and that by 2020 child poverty will have risen by 50%;
- (d) wishes to further highlight that the cycle between debt and poverty is well known, and that for children in debt-ridden families, they are more likely to be locked into a cycle of poverty; the Children's charity Barnardo's states that "poverty is the single greatest threat to the wellbeing of children and families";
- (e) reiterates the motion passed at December's Full Council meeting, which noted that Sheffield Brightside and Hillsborough has the 14th highest levels of child poverty of any constituency in the country with 39.7% of children (11,706 children) living in poverty and in Sheffield Central 34.9% of children (5,452 children) are living in poverty;
- (f) believes it is outrageous that in the fifth richest country in the world [i.e. the UK] children are increasingly having to suffer the consequences of poverty, and notes that from the beginning of the Coalition Government in 2010, children's charities have been warning that the Government's policies would result in increased child poverty and this has been seen through the significant growth in foodbanks in recent years;

- (g) regrets that the changes to Universal Credit announced in the Autumn Statement do not address the huge cuts made by this Government and recalls that the cuts to Universal Credit introduced by this Government have taken £2,100 per year from 2.5 million working families today and the measures in the Autumn Statement will give them back as little as £150;
- (h) notes research from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which highlights that lone parents with 2 children, working full time on the National Living Wage, have lost £2,586 per year due to changes in benefits since 2015;
- (i) welcomes Labour's proposal to reverse cuts to Universal Credit Work Allowances, to restore the important principle abandoned by this Government that work will always pay; and
- (j) supports the Private Member's Bill tabled by Dan Jarvis MP, which will receive its second reading in Parliament on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> February, and the related campaign to end child poverty; and this week's subsequent national Labour Party campaign in support of this.

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

For paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Substantive Motion (72) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Abtissam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben



Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

- Against paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil
- Abstained on paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Substantive Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox)
- For paragraphs (c), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion (55) - Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.
- Against paragraphs (c), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion (17) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley.
- Abstained on paragraphs (c), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox)

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

**Health and Social Care Funding**

- 10.1 It was formally moved by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, and formally seconded by Councillor Kieran Harpham, that this Council:-
- (a) believes that all health and social care staff should be thanked for their tremendous hard work and that their commitment and dedication should be acknowledged; it is not staff who are to blame for the continuing crisis at the NHS, but a government who consistently fail to fund this vital service;
  - (b) recognises that staff at the Northern General Hospital have been under incredible pressure this Autumn and Winter, and in October 2016, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust missed their A&E target with only 85.6 per cent of patients being seen within the four hours, against a target of 95 per cent (meaning that 2,633 patients waited too long), and believes this pressure on health services is leading to greater pressure on social care;
  - (c) supports NHS England's four-hour standard, which sets out that a minimum of 95 per cent of all patients to A&E will be treated within four hours; notes the widespread public and medical professional support for this standard, and believes that it is most concerning that the Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP, recently suggested that the four-hour target may be downgraded and no longer apply to minor injuries, and further believes that abandoning the four hour waiting time would be, in the words of Jonathan Ashworth MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Health, "a total admission of failure by this government";
  - (d) notes that ambulance services are also increasingly under pressure and deep condolences are given to the friends and family of a gentleman, aged 79, who died in the city after waiting two hours and forty minutes for an ambulance; the call was initially assessed as code Yellow, meaning that the incident involved a "potentially serious condition" and, under guidelines, the ambulance should have arrived in 40 minutes;
  - (e) wishes to further highlight that the NHS is coming under increasing pressures, in part due to the crisis in social care - £4.6 billion has been cut from the social care budget since 2010, and that NHS funding will fall per head of population in 2018-19 and 2019-20;
  - (f) supports calls on the Government to bring forward extra funding now for social care to help hospitals cope this winter, and to pledge a new improved funding settlement for the NHS and social care in the March 2017 Budget;

- (g) welcomes the Labour Party's call to the Government for an urgent £700 million for social care, and is deeply concerned that the Prime Minister Theresa May's government rejected this proposal, implicitly failing to understand the impact social care has on the wider NHS;
- (h) believes that Sheffield's Children's Hospital should be commended for seeing 98 per cent of youngsters within four hours, but raises concerns that such achievements will become increasingly unlikely without appropriate funding; and
- (i) understands that the NHS is experiencing the largest financial squeeze in its history and that 2017 will be a make or break moment for adult social care for local services provided by local councils and the NHS.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Bob Pullin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the deletion of paragraph (g) and the relettering of original paragraphs (h) and (i) as new paragraphs (g) and (h); and
- 2. the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-
  - (i) backs the campaign, co-ordinated by former Health Minister, the Rt. Hon. Norman Lamb MP, supported by local MPs Nick Clegg and Clive Betts, calling on the Government to establish a cross-party NHS and Care Convention to examine the future funding requirements of these services and agree a new, long-term settlement to guarantee their sustainability for future generations.

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

10.3.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for part 2 of the amendment, and abstained from voting on part 1 of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that all health and social care staff should be thanked for their tremendous hard work and that their commitment and dedication should be acknowledged; it is not staff who are to blame for the continuing crisis at the NHS, but a government who consistently fail to fund this vital service;
- (b) recognises that staff at the Northern General Hospital have been under incredible pressure this Autumn and Winter, and in October 2016, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust missed their A&E target with only 85.6 per cent of patients being seen within the four

- hours, against a target of 95 per cent (meaning that 2,633 patients waited too long), and believes this pressure on health services is leading to greater pressure on social care;
- (c) supports NHS England's four-hour standard, which sets out that a minimum of 95 per cent of all patients to A&E will be treated within four hours; notes the widespread public and medical professional support for this standard, and believes that it is most concerning that the Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP, recently suggested that the four-hour target may be downgraded and no longer apply to minor injuries, and further believes that abandoning the four hour waiting time would be, in the words of Jonathan Ashworth MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Health, "a total admission of failure by this government";
  - (d) notes that ambulance services are also increasingly under pressure and deep condolences are given to the friends and family of a gentleman, aged 79, who died in the city after waiting two hours and forty minutes for an ambulance; the call was initially assessed as code Yellow, meaning that the incident involved a "potentially serious condition" and, under guidelines, the ambulance should have arrived in 40 minutes;
  - (e) wishes to further highlight that the NHS is coming under increasing pressures, in part due to the crisis in social care - £4.6 billion has been cut from the social care budget since 2010, and that NHS funding will fall per head of population in 2018-19 and 2019-20;
  - (f) supports calls on the Government to bring forward extra funding now for social care to help hospitals cope this winter, and to pledge a new improved funding settlement for the NHS and social care in the March 2017 Budget;
  - (g) welcomes the Labour Party's call to the Government for an urgent £700 million for social care, and is deeply concerned that the Prime Minister Theresa May's government rejected this proposal, implicitly failing to understand the impact social care has on the wider NHS;
  - (h) believes that Sheffield's Children's Hospital should be commended for seeing 98 per cent of youngsters within four hours, but raises concerns that such achievements will become increasingly unlikely without appropriate funding; and
  - (i) understands that the NHS is experiencing the largest financial squeeze in its history and that 2017 will be a make or break moment for adult social care for local services provided by local councils and the NHS.

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

For paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) of the Motion (73)

- Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) of the Motion (0)

- Nil.

Abstained on paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) of the Motion (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

For paragraph (g) of the Motion (56)

- Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek,

Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraph (g) of the Motion (17) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley.

Abstained on paragraph (g) of the Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

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

### **Sheffield City Region Devolution Deal**

11.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the election of the regional mayor for Sheffield City Region has been postponed until May 2018;
- (b) notes with concern the press statement issued by the Leader of Barnsley Council (Councillor Sir Stephen Houghton) and the Mayor of Doncaster (Ros Jones) in support of exploring a Yorkshire-wide devolution option;
- (c) asserts that there is currently no Yorkshire-wide devolution deal on the table and notes the comments made by Northern Powerhouse Minister, Andrew Percy MP "I would urge leaders in South Yorkshire not to walk away because they will be in a position like the North-East where we take the proposal off the table because they have rejected it.";
- (d) believes that the economic geography of the Sheffield City Region is distinct from the rest of Yorkshire and has strong links across the county borders with areas such as Bassetlaw and Chesterfield;
- (e) wants the best for our local economy and is therefore disappointed that devolved powers and funding for Sheffield City Region are now at risk

because of local leaders' parochial disagreements;

- (f) believes this is further evidence, along with the disagreements on HS2, of a lack of effective local leadership; and
- (g) calls on the Leader of the Council to do everything in her power to reassure the public and businesses of Sheffield and to get the SCR Devolution Deal back on track.

11.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Julie Dore, and formally seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, 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 the election of a Sheffield City Region Mayor has been delayed due to the High Court ruling in December which required the City Region to undertake further consultation before the Secretary of State can make a final decision;
- (b) remains fully committed to the Sheffield City Region and the devolution deal which was hard fought following extensive negotiations with central government and will see significant investment for economic development into Sheffield City Region and greater local control of powers currently determined by central government in areas such as skills;
- (c) agrees that the geography of Sheffield City Region reflects our functional economic area and that the model of devolution which the Government is offering is fundamentally about economic regeneration in recognised travel-to-work areas, and welcomes the inclusion of Chesterfield and Bassetlaw as full constituent members of the Combined Authority;
- (d) welcomes that all partners are still committed to the Sheffield City Region and the Devolution Deal, which is the only deal on the table; and
- (e) believes that the additional consultation required should be undertaken as quickly as possible to ensure that the Sheffield City Region deal is finalised and all parliamentary approvals are secured as soon as possible to allow the region to secure the additional investment crucial to growing the economy and creating more jobs in Sheffield City Region.

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

11.3.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraph (a) of the amendment, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b) to (e) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

11.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph as follows:-

- ( ) calls on the Leader of the Council to be open to all options that would benefit Sheffield and the wider region through greater devolution of powers and funding.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the election of a Sheffield City Region Mayor has been delayed due to the High Court ruling in December which required the City Region to undertake further consultation before the Secretary of State can make a final decision;
- (b) remains fully committed to the Sheffield City Region and the devolution deal which was hard fought following extensive negotiations with central government and will see significant investment for economic development into Sheffield City Region and greater local control of powers currently determined by central government in areas such as skills;
- (c) agrees that the geography of Sheffield City Region reflects our functional economic area and that the model of devolution which the Government is offering is fundamentally about economic regeneration in recognised travel-to-work areas, and welcomes the inclusion of Chesterfield and Bassetlaw as full constituent members of the Combined Authority;
- (d) welcomes that all partners are still committed to the Sheffield City Region and the Devolution Deal, which is the only deal on the table; and
- (e) believes that the additional consultation required should be undertaken as quickly as possible to ensure that the Sheffield City Region deal is finalised and all parliamentary approvals are secured as soon as possible to allow the region to secure the additional investment crucial to growing the economy and creating more jobs in Sheffield City Region.

11.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraph (a) of the Substantive Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b) to (e) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)



**12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON**

**LGBT History Month**

12.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Neale Gibson, seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, that this Council:-

- (a) fully supports the commencing in February of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) History Month and welcomes the promotion of this throughout the city by the City Council and local LGBT groups;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of raising awareness and advancing education on matters affecting the LGBT community; to work to make educational and other institutions safe spaces for all LGBT communities and to promote the welfare of LGBT people, by ensuring that the education system recognises and enables LGBT people to achieve their full potential, so they contribute fully to society and lead fulfilled lives, which in turn benefits society as a whole;
- (c) believes LGBT History Month is a time when we can explore and share some hidden aspects of our country's past, both recent and remote and that this hidden history belongs to all of us and is part of our inheritance;
- (d) recognises that throughout history we can find many examples of people who refused to conform to the outward signs of the sex to which they were born, and we also find many stories of people who loved their own sex; some of them experienced serious persecution and some are remembered for the contributions they made to our culture and society, in particular in Sheffield, the Socialist, Edward Carpenter; and
- (e) acknowledges that their personal lives have often been suppressed or censored; to understand our present and imagine our future, we must first gain insight into our past; this is true of us as individuals, it is also true of societies; and believes that the Council has a moral obligation to ensure that this is well understood and as such:-
  - (i) supports the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP, Leader of the Labour Party, in his stance that a Labour government would add LGBT History Month to the national curriculum and that radical policy changes in the school curriculum would be implemented to better reflect gay issues;
  - (ii) supports the issuing of a formal apology to all gay men who were convicted under now abolished restrictive sex laws – and deplores the actions of the Conservative government in “talking out” a Private Member's Bill – the so-called Turing Bill - which would have pardoned all men living with UK convictions for same-sex offences committed before the law was changed; and
  - (iii) will fight against inequality and injustice wherever it is seen, and

recognises that a key part of this battle is in raising awareness and levels of education on these issues and this is why initiatives such as LGBT History Month are so important and should be encouraged throughout Sheffield.

- 12.1.1 (NOTE: Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a) to (d) and (e)(ii) and (iii) and voted against paragraph (e)(i) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

### **13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN**

#### **Waste Management**

- 13.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent Cabinet report "Waste Management Policies" which was passed by the Administration last month;
- (b) has concerns about some of the policy changes laid out by the Administration in this report, in particular, the proposal for a £20 charge for replacement black bins, even when a replacement is needed through no fault of the resident, such as theft or criminal damage;
- (c) believes that this charge is unfair and, with other savings that the Administration expects to be delivered through changes to the waste management contract and other policy changes, unnecessary;
- (d) believes that this charge will lead to more thefts of bins and more littering and fly tipping, which in turn will incur cleaning costs for the Council; and
- (e) calls on the Administration to reconsider this charge until further consultation is undertaken.

- 13.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Tony Downing, and formally seconded by Councillor Andy Bainbridge, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-

- (b) reaffirms that the £20 charge will not apply when a bin is damaged by the collection crew or is reported to have gone into the back of the collection vehicle;
- (c) reaffirms that, under the proposal, no customer is being charged for the new brown recycling bins and that the £20 charge for a replacement bin is a fair way to mitigate the cost of providing containers and will reduce the overall cost of the service to the Council and, in turn, local taxpayers;
- (d) states that the proposal for a £20 charge for a replacement bin brings

Sheffield in line with the other South Yorkshire local authorities, and that the proposed charge is actually less than the cost incurred in Rotherham and Doncaster and equal to the cost in Barnsley;

- (e) believes that the new bins will be much more durable and robust than the smaller blue bin-box currently used, and introduced by the previous Council Administration, and should therefore lead to less damage and loss; and
- (f) welcomes the replacement of the box-bin with an additional recycling bin.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent Cabinet report "Waste Management Policies" which was passed by the Administration last month;
- (b) reaffirms that the £20 charge will not apply when a bin is damaged by the collection crew or is reported to have gone into the back of the collection vehicle;
- (c) reaffirms that, under the proposal, no customer is being charged for the new brown recycling bins and that the £20 charge for a replacement bin is a fair way to mitigate the cost of providing containers and will reduce the overall cost of the service to the Council and, in turn, local taxpayers;
- (d) states that the proposal for a £20 charge for a replacement bin brings Sheffield in line with the other South Yorkshire local authorities, and that the proposed charge is actually less than the cost incurred in Rotherham and Doncaster and equal to the cost in Barnsley;
- (e) believes that the new bins will be much more durable and robust than the smaller blue bin-box currently used, and introduced by the previous Council Administration, and should therefore lead to less damage and loss; and
- (f) welcomes the replacement of the box-bin with an additional recycling bin.

13.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a), (e) and (f),

and voted against paragraphs (b) to (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

##### **Boxing**

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

- (a) recognises that boxing and related training can help where many social problems manifest themselves, for example, deprived communities and disadvantaged people, many who face a world of "gritty" social issues, such as gang-related crime, violence in their schools and local areas;
- (b) acknowledges that boxing has been described as "a universal language" and as a "working class sport played all over the world";
- (c) believes that, rather than serving as a release for aggression, the role of boxing is better viewed as a replacement for aggression;
- (d) further believes that everyone involved in boxing knows its benefits; it is a vehicle to learn or develop values and skills which lead to discipline, self-control and defence, exercise, fitness and diet, and above all, self-belief and confidence;
- (e) hopes to see more boxing gyms in more areas and boxing training available in all schools for those who wish to take part; and
- (f) further recognises that sport holds a unique position within the field of development, despite a limited understanding of the vital role it plays.

14.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Lisa Baines, and formally seconded by Councillor Mark Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the insertion, in paragraph (a), of the words "all sport, including" between the words "recognises that" and "boxing"; and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (g) to (k) as follows:-
  - (g) believes that though boxing can have a positive impact on individuals, it is essential that proper safeguards are in place for the safety of participants and that boxing clubs in our city, and throughout the country, comply with the proper safeguards, health and safety and care and protection of young people attending boxing clubs; and understands that medical studies have shown that there can be negative long-term effects for professional boxers and this is why it is so crucial that proper safety measures are in place for amateur boxing in our city;

- (h) acknowledges that Sheffield has a proud history of supporting boxing; the Olympian boxing team of 2016 trained at the English Institute of Sport and reference should be given to the legendary Brendon Ingle gym in Wincobank, where hundreds of children and adults train at the gym every week, together with professionals, and many Champions have been produced from the gym – specifically 4 x World Champions, 6 x European Champions, 15 x British and Commonwealth Champions - which makes him one of the most successful trainers ever to grace the sport; and notes that many of the children and young adults never actually box but enjoy the training, and youngsters from difficult backgrounds and from many different cultures attend and a lot of work is done within the community in breaking down racial barriers; Dominic Ingle often takes his boxers into schools, helping to build social cohesion and overcome racial tensions; and furthermore, Brendon Ingle was awarded the MBE a few years ago for his commitments to Boxing and the Wincobank Community and he and his trainers and volunteers are very highly respected and loved by the local community;
- (i) recognises that the present Administration has shown consistent commitment to helping boxing clubs which meet the required level of safeguarding and is taking action against unlicensed boxing in the city; of particular note in this is the Council’s work with the group Youth Justice and their member responsible for gangs in the city, Ronnie Tucker; with work being done to clamp down on unlicensed, or “white collar”, boxing that does not have the proper medical support on site, and work is being done to stop unlicensed boxing taking place at Council venues; Ronnie Tucker was commended by Sports England for his work with boxing in schools and he has stated publically about the support he has had from Councillors Mike Drabble and Jackie Drayton;
- (j) asserts that there are many more examples than the aforementioned of the work done by this Administration in support of all sporting clubs, including boxing, in our city and that, as long as proper safeguards are enforced, this Administration will continue to champion sporting clubs, such as boxing, in the city; and
- (k) asserts that Sheffield is a very safe city and that gang violence is comparatively low, but contends that Sheffield City Council will continue to work with communities on improving this.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recognises that all sport, including boxing and related training can help where many social problems manifest themselves, for example, deprived

- communities and disadvantaged people, many who face a world of "gritty" social issues, such as gang-related crime, violence in their schools and local areas;
- (b) acknowledges that boxing has been described as "a universal language" and as a "working class sport played all over the world";
  - (c) believes that, rather than serving as a release for aggression, the role of boxing is better viewed as a replacement for aggression;
  - (d) further believes that everyone involved in boxing knows its benefits; it is a vehicle to learn or develop values and skills which lead to discipline, self-control and defence, exercise, fitness and diet, and above all, self-belief and confidence;
  - (e) hopes to see more boxing gyms in more areas and boxing training available in all schools for those who wish to take part;
  - (f) further recognises that sport holds a unique position within the field of development, despite a limited understanding of the vital role it plays;
  - (g) believes that though boxing can have a positive impact on individuals, it is essential that proper safeguards are in place for the safety of participants and that boxing clubs in our city, and throughout the country, comply with the proper safeguards, health and safety and care and protection of young people attending boxing clubs; and understands that medical studies have shown that there can be negative long-term effects for professional boxers and this is why it is so crucial that proper safety measures are in place for amateur boxing in our city;
  - (h) acknowledges that Sheffield has a proud history of supporting boxing; the Olympian boxing team of 2016 trained at the English Institute of Sport and reference should be given to the legendary Brendon Ingle gym in Wincobank, where hundreds of children and adults train at the gym every week, together with professionals, and many Champions have been produced from the gym – specifically 4 x World Champions, 6 x European Champions, 15 x British and Commonwealth Champions - which makes him one of the most successful trainers ever to grace the sport; and notes that many of the children and young adults never actually box but enjoy the training, and youngsters from difficult backgrounds and from many different cultures attend and a lot of work is done within the community in breaking down racial barriers; Dominic Ingle often takes his boxers into schools, helping to build social cohesion and overcome racial tensions; and furthermore, Brendon Ingle was awarded the MBE a few years ago for his commitments to Boxing and the Wincobank Community and he and his trainers and volunteers are very highly respected and loved by the local community;
  - (i) recognises that the present Administration has shown consistent commitment to helping boxing clubs which meet the required level of

safeguarding and is taking action against unlicensed boxing in the city; of particular note in this is the Council's work with the group Youth Justice and their member responsible for gangs in the city, Ronnie Tucker; with work being done to clamp down on unlicensed, or "white collar", boxing that does not have the proper medical support on site, and work is being done to stop unlicensed boxing taking place at Council venues; Ronnie Tucker was commended by Sports England for his work with boxing in schools and he has stated publically about the support he has had from Councillors Mike Drabble and Jackie Drayton;

- (j) asserts that there are many more examples than the aforementioned of the work done by this Administration in support of all sporting clubs, including boxing, in our city and that, as long as proper safeguards are enforced, this Administration will continue to champion sporting clubs, such as boxing, in the city; and
- (k) asserts that Sheffield is a very safe city and that gang violence is comparatively low, but contends that Sheffield City Council will continue to work with communities on improving this.

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 3 March 2017, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Andy Nash Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Andy Bainbridge Steve Wilson	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Mohammad Maroof Alison Teal Nasima Akther
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed Paul Scriven	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell Jack Scott
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Alan Law Abtisam Mohamed Abdul Khayum	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> Mike Drabble Dianne Hurst Peter Rippon
4	<i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Michelle Cook Kieran Harpham Magid Magid	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Dawn Dale Peter Price Garry Weatherall
5	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Mark Jones Talib Hussain	14	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Cate McDonald Chris Peace	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Robert Murphy	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Sue Auckland Steve Ayris	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Penny Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Craig Gamble Pugh Adam Hanrahan	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Lisa Banes Terry Fox Pat Midgley	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood

**1. FORMER COUNCILLOR CATH WHITTY AND FORMER LORD MAYOR'S CONSORT MR ROBERT LEEK**

- 1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) reported with sadness, the death, in the previous week, of former Councillor Cath Whitty, who had served as a Member of the Council from 1990 to 1994. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in her memory. The Lord Mayor stated that an opportunity for Members to pay tribute to Ms. Whitty would be provided at the Council meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> April.
- 1.2 The Lord Mayor also reported with sadness, the death, on 17<sup>th</sup> February, of Mr. Robert Leek, former Lord Mayor's Consort in 2003/04.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 2.1 An apology for absence was received from the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy).

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

3.1. Declarations of interest by Members of the Council

- 3.1.1 During consideration of Amendment Number 2 on Agenda Item 5 – Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18 (See Minute 7 below), Councillor Ian Saunders declared a personal interest in relation to paragraph (14)(xi) of the amendment on the grounds that he was a foster carer, and he indicated that, although he would vote on the amendment, he would abstain on that part of it.
- 3.1.2 During consideration of Amendment Number 3 on Agenda Item 5 – Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18 (See Minute 7 below), Councillors Talib Hussain and Mohammad Maroof declared personal interests in relation to those parts of the amendment that related to zero or low emission taxi vehicles, on the grounds that they were taxi drivers.

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**

4.1 Petitions

- 4.1.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Properly Assess the Cumulative Impact of Traffic Levels in Oughtibridge

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition, containing 685 signatures, requesting the Council to properly assess the cumulative impact of traffic levels in Oughtibridge.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Terry Barrow who stated that there were significant developments being planned in the Stocksbridge Valley and there was concern as to their cumulative effect. She referred in particular to a planning application for the development of land at Platts Lane, Oughtibridge for which it was proposed to reduce the railway bridge to a single lane and to install traffic signals. It was thought that this would adversely affect the village. In addition, there were concerns about safety on the A6102 on which there had been near misses, accidents involving cars and other non-reportable incidents. It was considered that this situation would worsen if more developments went ahead.

It was suggested that a number of simple and relatively inexpensive options were considered, to include a review of the traffic system in the village; and appropriate traffic management measures as a condition of any planning application. A site meeting with the Cabinet Member and officers was also requested to review traffic and safety issues.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport. Councillor Iqbal stated that local Councillors had also made him aware of this matter. He said that he would be pleased to arrange a site visit with regard to the traffic issues in Oughtibridge. In relation to planning applications, the Council considered each application on its own merits and the implications of any application would be considered at that time.

#### 4.1.2 Petition Expressing Concern at the Implications of the Housing and Planning Act

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 412 signatures, expressing concern at the implications of the Housing and Planning Act.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Carrie Hedderwick who stated that the Housing and Planning Act would not solve the housing crisis but it would worsen the situation. It would affect families if tenants were issued with short term, insecure tenancies and would put more people into private rented housing if the local authority housing stock reduced. Some areas might be classed as brownfield sites and redeveloped with minimum of social housing as part of any new housing development. Several Councils had stated opposition to the Act and the campaign had succeeded in the Government dropping a proposal to make tenants pay to stay if their household income reached a certain threshold and the Right to Buy for housing association tenants had also been postponed. What was needed was more genuinely affordable housing to rent; and a comprehensive programme of council house building.

The petition requested the Council to send out information to tenants about the

implications of the Act and to hold public meetings concerning the Act and to stand with others in opposition to the Act.

Carrie Hedderwick said that Councillor Dunn had responded to her in relation to questions about this matter. She said that affordable housing was at an all-time low and whilst wages were stagnant, rents were increasing. She commented with regard to Right to Buy, fixed term and secure tenancies; the proportion of housing development set aside for affordable housing and the debt cap and requested that events were held to explain the implications of the Housing and Planning Act.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing. Councillor Dunn stated that she had written a letter for the Star newspaper, although the letter had not been published and for reasons of length, some details had been left out of the letter.

There had been significant discussions in relation to the debt cap and Councillor Dunn said that she was going to visit the Government Office on 7 March in relation to the issue. With regard to public meetings, Councillor Dunn said that she had sent an email to the lead petitioner detailing the events which had taken place relating to the Housing and Planning Act. Councillor Dunn stated that she would be pleased to meet the petitioners with regard to this matter.

#### 4.2 Public Questions

##### 4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Best Value Guidance

June Cattell referred to a petition presented to the Council in February 2016 concerning the ability of local authorities to make ethical decisions on procurement. The Government had recently published a consultation process, particularly aimed at Local Authorities and the Secretary of State for Communities had announced his intention to put last February's guidance on a legal footing. The proposal was to add a new paragraph to the Best Value Statutory Guidance stating that authorities should not implement or pursue boycotts other than where formal legal sanctions, embargoes and restrictions had been put in place by the Government. The questions asked in the consultation were regarding whether the wording was clear and specific.

She asked if the Cabinet Member would agree that this did not constitute consultation in any meaningful form and that the Council should complain about what she said was the sham basis of the consultation and the limited timescale; and strongly reiterate its opposition to what she said was an attack on principles of localism. She asked the Cabinet Member to reiterate his statement of April 2016 that Sheffield City Council did not invest in companies which breached international law.

Councillor Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that he would be pleased to repeat that the Council did not invest in companies that break international law. He said that it should be for a local authority to decide

how it made investments, not the Government. He said that he did not think that the consultation to which June Cattell had referred was helpful or meaningful. Council officers were of the opinion that a change to more formal footing would not affect the work which the Council was doing with regards to ethical procurement.

#### 4.2.2 Public Question Concerning Children's Centres

Mike Levery asked whether the Children's Centres that did not become Family Centres would operate the same core hours as Family Centres, with the existing range of early years services and drop-in facility. He also asked whether a second stage of consultation would take place with regard to the detailed plans before implementing these changes, as other local authorities had done.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that the proposals in the consultation included the 7 locality areas comprising one main site, a link site and outreach provision at a variety of venues. Provision would be run at various days and times, including weekends and at other times. There would be both core services and additional services. The detail on what, where and when would be a matter for discussion by the Multi Agency Partnership Board which would assess need and decide accordingly.

Councillor Drayton said that in the Gleadless Valley for example, a Link Centre would be installed whereas previously, there had been no such provision.

With regard to consultation, Councillor Drayton stated that Cabinet had considered a proposal with regard to consultation on the development of a new delivery model for services from pre-birth to 19 years and 25 years for young people with a disability or special educational needs. Section 5A of the Childcare Act 2006 referred to the duty with regards provision of Children's Centres to meet need and the Multi Agency Partnership Board had a role in this regard.

#### 4.2.3 Public Question Concerning Vulnerable and Disabled People

Adam Butcher asked how in the current budget round we could make sure that the most vulnerable people in the City were looked after. He asked how we could ensure that more disabled people voted in elections and also how Sheffield could make sure that it was a disability friendly City in the run up to the Special Olympics 2017.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that austerity affected people who depended upon public services and those who were most vulnerable. The Council protected people where it could. For example, Council Tax was to be increased so there was a resource for those people most in need and it would include a social care precept and there would also be an increase in the Council Tax Hardship Fund of £200K. An Equalities Impact Assessment had been produced with regard to the budget proposals, so

there was awareness of their impact. Appendix G of the budget report set out the Equality Impact Assessments. The budget maintained the level of child social workers and protected Special Educational Needs and Disability services and funding for voluntary groups, in order to mitigate the effects of austerity.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, stated that with regard to voting in elections, both she and Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, were to work on this issue with the Disability Hub to consider issues of access and participation in the electoral process. Councillor McDonald said that any ideas that Mr Butcher had in this regard would be welcome.

Councillor McDonald said that the Learning Disabilities Partnership Group would consider the issues relating to Sheffield as a disability friendly City. It was important to use the Special Olympics to promote positive images of people and to have effective communications. Stagecoach was a sponsor for the Special Olympics and its drivers would be specially trained. The objective was to make sure that activity continued beyond the Olympic event and that there was a legacy with regard to sport so as to increase opportunities for people and ensure that they were not marginalised. In addition, a Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee was examining the issue of hate crime which was also an important issue with regard to building a disability friendly City.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that with regard to children and young people, and the electoral process, citizenship work took place in schools. The Council was also trying to encourage all young people to travel independently. Whilst this process might take time, it helped them in a journey to greater independence and changed their lives.

#### 4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Street Trees

Paul Brooke asked a question with regard to the assertion that there were financial costs to the Council as a result of campaigners delaying tree felling. He referred to a clause in the Streets Ahead contract which said that the Council would not be responsible for any protester or financial loss caused by them. He asked for an explanation of how the protests were causing additional costs to the Council.

Calvin Payne asked a question about whether it was in the public interest for people to be arrested, detained and charged for something which did not appear to have been a crime; and with regard to the use of police time and personnel in attending peaceful and lawful action.

Justin Buxton asked a question concerning whether the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Environment had read the Streets Ahead Contract. Secondly, he asked about the resources for oversight and monitoring of the contract. Thirdly, Mr Buxton asked about the potential use of Flexi Pave and the effect of protests on its installation.

Annette Taberner asked whether the Leader of the Council had signed the Streets Ahead contract. She also stated that she had been informed that she would be arrested if she peacefully protested in her own garden. She asked whether the Leader of the Council felt this was a disproportionate use of legislation and was the Council concerned to help ensure the rights of peaceful protest and how was it protecting those rights?

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to the questions. He stated that there was a clause in the Streets Ahead contract which said that Amey was responsible. However, there was also a clause which stated that if the delay was due to factors outside of Amey's control, for example, injunctions; protests, which prevented them carrying on with work; court cases; or the setting up of the Independent Tree Panel, then there was a cost to such activity and that cost came back to the Council. The costs did not impact on Amey's profits.

The contract was specific and complex. Both the current Labour administration and the former Liberal Democrat administration of the Council were involved in putting the contract together. The delays had resulted in costs to the Council because of the months of time lost, which had prevented the resurfacing and repair of 75km of pavements and 6km of road from being repaired and brought back up to standard. He said that it was anticipated that the costs to the Council would run into millions. That included court costs; the use of additional crews to attempt to catch up and rescheduling work. This was a cost to the Council Tax payers in the City and it was hard to accept.

Councillor Lodge said that the Council did support the right to peaceful protest and the right of people to conduct their lawful work in the City. It was appreciated that people have a right to protest but it was also asked that people conduct themselves in a manner which did not put anyone at risk and which did not put the people at work, the public or protesters themselves at risk. Any delays to the tree replacement programme would have an impact on Council Tax payers in the City.

With regards to the use of arrest by the police, that was an issue which would need to be taken up with South Yorkshire Police. The Council was responsible as the highways authority and had duties under the Highways Act and equalities legislation to ensure that the highways were at a good standard for everybody. Issues around policing were a matter for South Yorkshire Police.

Councillor Lodge said that, with regard to a Radio Sheffield 'Hot Seat' programme which he had appeared on and with regard to the reading of the Streets Ahead contract, he had commented to the presenter, Toby Foster that he should read contracts in reference to contractual issues which he had faced. Councillor Lodge confirmed that he had had sight of all parts of the contract that he needed to know. A City Councillor could make a request to the Council's Monitoring Officer with regards to access to the contract and there were legal criteria with regard to the need to see the information.

He referred to email correspondence with Mr Buxton and asked Mr Buxton to

send the email in question to him again and he would look at the issues which had he raised including with regard to Flexi Pave and would respond to him in writing.

As regards resources for the oversight of the Streets Ahead programme, at the time, when the Cabinet Member had addressed this issue, it was considered that there were adequate resources. However, since that time there had been delays, court cases and rescheduling of work and there were additional costs.

The Council did support the right to peaceful protest and recognised that right. It had a duty, with other organisations, to ensure that people had that right. In addition, people were asked to allow the Council, Amey and other organisations to carry out their work. The matter had been to the High Court and had been tested in that place.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, said that regard to the Streets Ahead contract, she did not sign the contract. She confirmed that she did have access to the contract.

## **5. REPRESENTATIONS, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

5.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that:-

- (a) Councillor Michelle Cook be appointed to serve on the Learn Sheffield Board in place of Councillor Mike Drabble; and
- (b) Councillor Lisa Banes be appointed to serve on the Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust in place of Councillor Bryan Lodge.

## **6. SUSPENSION OF PROCEDURAL RULES**

6.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that as regards Agenda Item 5 (Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18), 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 to remove the 3 minute time limit on the speeches of the movers and seconders of amendments, and a new time limit be set for those speeches of 10 minutes for the movers and 5 minutes for the seconders, with all other speakers continuing to have 3 minutes; and
- (b) Council Procedure Rule 17.11(a) be suspended to remove the right of reply for the mover of the motion.



## **7. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2017/18**

- 7.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Peter Rippon and formally seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that the following decisions taken by the Cabinet at its meeting on 15th February, 2017, arising from its consideration of reports of the Acting Executive Director, Resources on the Revenue Budget 2017/18 and the Capital Programme 2017/18, be approved:-

### **REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18**

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 3rd March 2017:-

- (a) to approve a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m;
- (b) to approve a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (c) to approve the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report;
- (d) to note that, based on the estimated expenditure level set out in Appendix 3 to the report, the amounts shown in part B of Appendix 6 would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, in accordance with sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (e) to note 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. Further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the report;
- (f) to note the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner and of South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council’s area;
- (g) to approve the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table in paragraph 177 of the report;
- (h) to note the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position;
- (i) to approve the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (j) to approve the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the report;

- (k) to agree 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;
- (l) to approve a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the report; and
- (m) to agree that authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Communities to set – subject to budgetary constraints – a framework of care home & home care fee increases with effect from 1 April 2017.”

### **CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2017/18**

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 3rd March 2017, that Members:-

- (a) note the specific projects included in the years 2017-18 to 2022-23 programmes at Appendix 9. 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;
- (b) note the proposed Capital Programme for the 6 years to 2022/23 as per Appendix 9 of the report; and
- (c) approve the Corporate Resource Pool policy outlined in Appendix 4 such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2017/18 unless explicitly stated. Further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve.”

7.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2017, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (1) 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 cuts to staffing numbers;
- (2) regrets that since 2010, central government funding to Sheffield City Council has been decimated, and notes that government funding is reducing, meaning the Council has to find £40m worth of savings for the

financial year;

- (3) notes the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement details the change in core spending power for Sheffield amounts to a reduction of 2.0% (compared to the England average of 1.1%) from 2016/17 to 2017/18;
- (4) notes that £40million worth of savings is needed to be made from the Council's budget for the next year, and is in addition to the £350m of savings already made since the formation of the Liberal Democrat-Conservative coalition government in 2010;
- (5) 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 2017/18 budget was estimated to be the third year that the cuts were over;
- (6) believes that the fact that the Council now faces further cuts over the coming year(s) is a damning indictment of the failure of the previous coalition government to eliminate the deficit, despite inflicting unprecedented cuts to public services and that Labour's growth-led recovery would have cut the deficit at a much quicker rate;
- (7) regrets that the current government are continuing with the same failed policies of the previous coalition government; continuing to cut local government services to the bone, whilst at the same time implementing policies which only benefit the very wealthy, such as raising the threshold for inheritance tax and increasing the 40p income tax band;
- (8) believes that Councils are bearing the brunt of an austerity programme in its seventh year; it is, as such, this Council's contention that the continuation of austerity is a political choice by the Government based on their ideological commitment to shrinking the state, rather than an economic imperative, a belief shared by the Liberal Democrats who went along with this at every step of the way when in coalition government;
- (9) believes that the Labour Party is right to call to an immediate end the unnecessary and deeply damaging austerity programme devised by the Coalition Government and now continued by the incumbent Government and notes that the Labour Party is united in its total opposition of this;
- (10) notes that in addition to the cuts being forced on local authorities, the increasing external pressures such as an ageing population and increased demand for services at an increased cost, and the current crisis in adult social care, is making it harder and harder for councils to balance their budgets and provide the desired services;
- (11) believes that the current crisis in social care has reached a "breaking point", but that this crisis has been seven years in the making as government funding to services have become more sparse;

- (12) notes that the Council spends a significant portion of its budget on adult social care but that, due to increasing pressures, it is getting harder to provide the necessary services for adult social care, and that this is in part due to external factors such as an ageing population and increased demands for services at an increased cost;
- (13) highlights that in addition to the increasing pressure on services, central government grants and funding are being reduced and this has resulted in an increasing “budget gap”, and this is projected to have grown to £116 million by 2021/22;
- (14) 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;
- (15) believes that due to the magnitude of government cuts over the past seven years and increased pressure on services, it was unavoidable that the Council would seek to put up Council Tax;
- (16) further believes it is unavoidable to implement the Chancellor’s social care “precept” of three per cent as outlined in the 2015 Spending Review and Autumn Statement;
- (17) notes that whilst the Government have promised not to increase taxes, it is in effect forcing local authorities to do this work for them, with councils needing to increase Council Tax in order to try to plug the shortfall in finances caused by increasing pressures and the reductions in central government grants;
- (18) believes that the three per cent Council Tax precept for social care does not even fully cover the Council’s need to pay providers properly so they can fulfil their obligations to pay staff the National Living Wage, and that the precept is not enough to stem the funding crisis;
- (19) makes an additional point on the above in regard to social care, that despite the short-term financial pressures caused by the introduction of the National Living Wage, it may have a positive impact on our local care market by driving up the attractiveness of working in the sector and therefore increasing the security and stability of our providers (which in turn may then require less intervention on the Council’s part), and notes that the Labour Party is committed to an actual National Living Wage (as determined by the independent Living Wage Foundation) rather than the higher rate of minimum wage we currently have and, additionally, this Administration contends that we are not in funding crisis because of the need to pay care workers a decent wage but because of more systemic problems;

- (20) notes that for 2017/18, the additional £5.4m raised through the social care precept still leaves the Council needing to find a further £35m, including a revenue support grant (RSG) cut of £23m, and that the precept fails to address the increased cost of providing social care alone, and believes that the real issues the Government must address is the lack of funding for local authorities and the need to tackle the social care crisis, however, this Administration believes it would be irresponsible not to use this funding to protect care services as far as possible and this is why we are doing so;
- (21) reinstates its support to calls for the Government to provide emergency funds of £700 million into social care to help stem the funding crisis, and states its disappointment that the Government are so far unwilling to grant this request despite it clearly being required;
- (22) notes that most local authorities are facing similar difficulties to meet the rising social care pressures; exemplified by Surrey Council originally proposing to hold a referendum on increasing Council Tax by 15% in order to meet their social care costs, and believes that this was only dropped after a deal, seemingly made in secret, was forged by the Government and the Conservative-run Surrey Council to provide additional central government funding to spare the Government any embarrassment;
- (23) believes it is incredulous that a special deal for Surrey Council seems to have been agreed by the Government behind closed doors and this Council questions whether the Government have finally recognised that local government is grossly underfunded, as seen by their “special deal” to Surrey; and that the Government should recognise that there will be a £2.6bn shortfall in social care funding by 2020;
- (24) contends that if a deal was struck, Government Ministers should offer the same deal given to Surrey to all councils, regardless of political affiliation;
- (25) believes we have a crisis in social care, resulting from the Coalition Government’s cuts to local authority funding and the continuation of these cuts by the present Government, and that secret backroom deals are not the answer as we urgently need a proper solution and to provide councils with the funding they need to solve this crisis;
- (26) notes the similarities of the Government’s 2016 £300 million relief fund, whereby Sheffield received nothing, yet the vast majority of funding went to Conservative-controlled areas; the largest beneficiary was Surrey, getting £24m, whilst £19m went 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;

- (27) acknowledges that the Government has provided a new Adult Social Care Support Grant of £241m nationally, but that it is only available for 2017/18 and this Council believes the Grant is beyond feeble in its attempt to meet the required funding level; the Adult Social Care Support Grant allocates funding according to the Social Care needs formula, which does not take into account the ability to raise funds through the social care precept, and is financed from a reduced New Homes Bonus allocation; this new grant is estimated to only provide additional funding of £2.7m to Sheffield and is a temporary measure for one year only; making it a small help in the short-term but it is completely inadequate to cover the financial shortfall and provides no longer term benefits;
- (28) reinstates that this Administration is committed to helping those who are struggling to pay for Council Tax and will renew last year's Council Tax Support Scheme, which last year helped over 52,000 households, and will continue to call for the Government to reintroduce a fully funded council tax benefit scheme;
- (29) believes that the Administration's continuation of the Council Tax Support Scheme shows that only a Labour council can be trusted to make sure that tax rises are not "balanced on the backs of the poor" and notes that this is in stark contrast to the actions of the Liberal Democrats in coalition government who raised VAT and slashed disability benefits, affecting most the very poorest, whilst at the same time reducing the top-rate of tax for the very wealthiest;
- (30) reaffirms the Administration's housing strategy, as set out in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), and commitment to social housing; highlighting that despite the challenging financial climate, the Authority is almost one third of the way toward its target of 1,000 extra council homes; with a switch of focus from acquisitions to new build with no overall increase in the cost of the programme, and that a higher percentage of new builds within the programme will help us to build the mix of housing that we need and we will continue to deliver, as planned, improvements to our tenants' homes to make sure they continue to be well maintained over the next 5 years;
- (31) notes that as a result of budget cuts, the Council could lose up to 225 jobs during the financial year 2017/18; and that this Administration, as in previous years, will take steps to minimise redundancies, such as offering voluntary severance and voluntary early retirement schemes, as well as using vacancies not yet filled;
- (32) expresses sincere and heartfelt sympathy to those members of staff who are losing their jobs through redundancy and regrets that the Government's cuts and austerity programme has made redundancies unavoidable;

- (33) believes that despite the difficulties, this Administration has provided six years of progress for the city and is committed to bringing about positive changes for the people of Sheffield; improving living standards for all and driving up growth for our local economy; as such we welcome the exciting developments of the Sheffield Retail Quarter and new investment into the city region from McLaren and Boeing and will constantly seek to build on our successes;
- (34) therefore requests the Acting Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council’s Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/2018 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted;
- (35) notes those specific projects included in the years 2017/18 to 2022/23 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;
- (36) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 6 years to 2022/23 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme;
- (37) 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 2017/18 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (38) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Acting Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2017/18, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>	<b><u>Summary Revenue Budget</u></b>	<b>Original Budget 2017/18</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
66,423	Children Young People and Families	66,239
136,587	Communities	140,061
129,101	Place	128,742
1,900	Policy Performance and Communications	1,898
52,224	Resources	53,200

<u>386,235</u>		<u>390,140</u>
	<b>Corporate Budgets:</b>	
	<b>Specific Grants</b>	
-74,601	PFI Grant	-74,437
-9,323	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,029
-1,490	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,467
-2,880	Small Business Rates Relief	-3,976
0	Improved Better Care Fund	-2,188
0	CCG Better Care Fund Income	-5,000
0	Adult Social Care Grant (2017/18 only)	-2,717
	<b>Corporate Items</b>	
8,200	Redundancy Provision	6,200
-18,846	Pension Costs	-13,567
8,405	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	7,029
-698	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
2,700	Independent Living Fund Pressure	0
4,555	Better Care Fund	3,000
0	Social Care Risk	2,000
0	Strengthening Families - Think Forward Investment	4,000
25,094	Schools and Howden PFI	25,285
600	Infrastructure Investment	900
27	Payment to Parish Councils	22
300	ICT Refresh	300
-9,300	Better Care Fund	0
80,100	Pension Deficit Payment	0
1,067	Other	1,523
	<b>Capital Financing Costs</b>	
23,681	General Capital Financing Costs	22,944
8,314	Highways PFI Capital Financing Costs	11,630
28,199	MSF Capital Financing Costs	18,844
	<b>Reserves Movements</b>	
-882	Contribution from Reserves	-7,604
-53,400	Reserves Movements Relating to Pension Early Payment	20,417
<u>406,057</u>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<u>395,551</u>
	<b>Financing of Net Expenditure</b>	
-90,592	Revenue Support Grant	-67,790
-106,131	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-96,746
-29,124	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-39,583
-176,467	Council Tax income	-182,116
-283	Collection Fund surplus	-398
-3,460	Social Care Precept	-8,918



---

<b>-406,057</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-395,551</b>
-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

---

- (39) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (40) 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;
- (41) notes the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position;
- (42) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (43) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (44) agrees that authority be delegated to the Acting Executive Director of Resources 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;
- (45) approves a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (46) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 177 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (47) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (48) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £512,236 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (49) notes the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;
- (50) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £395.551m set out in paragraph (38) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below

would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, 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 2017/18 REVENUE BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2017, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
  - (a) for the whole council area as:  
**133,743.89** (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 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts is:  
**£ 191,034,345 .**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£ 1,343,486,330** 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) **£ 1,151,939,749** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£ 191,546,581** 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) **£ 1,432.1894** 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) **£ 512,236** 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) £ **1,428.3595** 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 overleaf.
5. £ **8,918,499** 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 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

#### Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96

#### Bradfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Bradfield Parish Council	26.85	31.32	35.80	40.27	49.22	58.17	67.12	80.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51

#### Ecclesfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.67	12.45	14.23	16.01	19.56	23.12	26.68	32.01
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97

**Stocksbridge Town Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.65	24.09	27.53	30.97	37.86	44.74	51.62	61.94
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

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 2017/18	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96
Bradfield Parish Council	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

**Appendix 6c**

Parish Council	Tax Base	2016/17				2017/18					
		Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Council Tax Increase

Budget Council 03/03/17

Bradfield	5,663.47	223,611	39.4831	10,005	233,616	5,713.66	230,105	40.2727	8,004	238,109	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,088.35	141,242	15.5410	10,041	151,283	9,149.98	146,466	16.0072	8,033	154,499	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,665.37	111,299	30.3651	7,224	118,524	3,675.84	113,849	30.9724	5,779	119,629	2.00%
Total/average	18,417.19	476,153	25.8537	27,270	503,423	18,539.48	490,420	26.4527	21,816	12,236	2.32%

7.2.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council, and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Ben Curran) following a Point of Order raised by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed as to an issue of factual accuracy, the amendment as circulated at the meeting was altered by the substitution of the word “believes” for the word “notes” at the beginning of paragraph (8)).

7.2.2 Motion to move to next business

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.13) the Council does now move to the next business and that the question be now put.

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

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

For the amendment (53) - Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the amendment (28) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten,

Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.

Abstained on the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

7.3 It was then moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 15th February, 2017, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (1) would like to thank the staff who have been so helpful and accommodating during this budget setting process, and all of Sheffield City Council's staff who continue to work so hard for the people of Sheffield;
- (2) recognises that the last few years have been difficult for Local Government, as they have had to take their share of responsibility for balancing the books and reducing the UK's current budget deficit following the 2008 financial crash and what the International Monetary Fund described as the worst global recession since World War II;
- (3) condemns the current Government's plan to restrict local government funding further until at least 2020, believing this to be above and beyond what is necessary, forcing Local Authorities to raise regressive Council Tax, instead of funding local government more fairly out of general taxation;
- (4) particularly condemns the current Government's approach to funding the NHS and Adult Social Care, and believes that the Adult Social Care precept is a sticking plaster over a gaping wound and that a new long term funding settlement is desperately needed to sustain vital services, particularly for places like Sheffield which had a relatively low council tax base but a high level of need;
- (5) believes that although the Council is facing financially difficult times, the current Administration has still had choices about where to spend our money, and have often made the wrong choices over the past 6 years, for example:-
  - (i) protecting tax payer subsidies for Trade Unions whilst slashing funding for libraries;

- (ii) continuing to spend vast amounts on Council spin doctors whilst cutting front line services; and
  - (iii) spending millions on costly consultants whilst allowing care homes to close;
- (6) further believes that this city still suffers from the poor choices made by previous Labour Administrations, particularly the financial burden of around £19million every year until 2024 to repay the debt from the major sports facilities associated with the financially disastrous World Student Games, even after Don Valley Stadium has now been demolished;
- (7) is disappointed that the Sheffield City Region Devolution Deal has been delayed and, as a result, £30million of central government funding that was going to be devolved to Sheffield City Region has been held back for another year, at a time when it is needed the most;
- (8) is deeply concerned for the future of the Devolution Deal and future associated funding given the perceived lack of enthusiasm amongst some South Yorkshire leaders for the deal in its current form, despite it being the only deal available from the Government, and believes that this is in part due to the weak leadership of Sheffield;
- (9) believes that, even more concerning than some of their financial choices, is the way this Administration operates, centralising decision making and often ignoring the concerns and wishes of the people of Sheffield;
- (10) asserts that the purpose of this Council is to represent and work for the people of Sheffield, and that it is important that our decision making reflects the interests of the city as a whole;
- (11) notes the growing number of large petitions being presented to this Council, and believes this demonstrates that a change of approach is needed;
- (12) believes that there is a better, different way for a city council to operate and that this budget amendment demonstrates that it is possible, even in difficult times, to be responsive and work with local people;
- (13) believes that local Councillors and local people are often best placed to take decisions over the things that affect them and their local areas and therefore wants to revolutionise how decisions are made in this Council, by devolving real budgets over to communities, to be spent on their priorities, not the Labour Party's;
- (14) by making some simple savings and spending the same money differently, the Liberal Democrat alternative budget would:-
  - (i) keep Hurlfield View dementia respite centre open by retendering

the contract to provide the service, recognising that this cannot be achieved in the short term; and in parallel, will seek to cancel the newly-let community-based contracts;

- (ii) devolve £1.4 million of Local Transport Funding to local communities to spend on the highway improvements that they think are the most important; this could be spent on safe crossings for school pupils, such as the badly needed crossings for school children at Hangingwater Road in Fulwood and at Station Road in Halfway;
- (iii) establish a new “Greener Neighbourhoods Fund” of almost £1million to be spent by local people on improving their local environment, whether that be through retaining highway trees, park improvements, innovative recycling schemes or community gardens;
- (iv) clean up Sheffield by investing in a task force to crack down on litter, fly tipping, graffiti and dog mess, and reversing a small cut to this budget; this could also generate income for the Council by increasing the number of fines issued to people who don’t respect our city;
- (v) introduce free evening and Sunday parking in the city centre to encourage footfall and help city centre business to thrive;
- (vi) invest in regeneration projects for Woodseats and Hillsborough centres with unused funds earmarked for bringing empty shops back into use;
- (vii) investigate the possibility of a “Sheffield Pound”, a local currency that would encourage spending on local business;
- (viii) fund more staff posts in the Council’s Private Sector Housing team to deal with some of the problems in the city’s fast growing private rented housing sector;
- (ix) support Citizen’s Advice Bureau with an increase in grant funding;
- (x) put aside extra funding for more school crossing patrols that do not qualify for a patrol under the Council’s current criteria, to bring the numbers back to 2011 levels;
- (xi) support Sheffield’s foster carers, who look after some of our city’s most challenging and vulnerable children, and encourage more people to sign up to become foster families with a discretionary reimbursement of Council Tax; this has the potential to save the Council millions in reducing the amount spent on agency foster placements;



- (xii) support Associate Libraries and their volunteers by providing professional librarian support; and
  - (xiii) give a small budget to local Councillors to spend on commissioning activities for young and old people in their areas, to replace some of the lost activities from the closure of Activity Sheffield;
- (15) believes that the people of Sheffield deserve a City Council that provides good value for money for all residents of Sheffield, is open for business, is responsive to and works with the people of Sheffield and protects our natural environment and heritage which make our city such a great place to live;
- (16) therefore requests the Acting Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/2018 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

### **REVENUE BUDGET**

#### **General Fund**

<b>Savings</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Investments / spending options</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Reduce posts within the Communications team	125	Discretionary reimbursement of Council Tax for foster carers	275
Reduce the number of Cabinet posts by 1	9	Retender the contract for Hurlfield View to continue to provide the current level of service	400
Withdraw funding from Sheffield City Partnership Board	10	Work with community groups to investigate the possibility of a Sheffield Pound	24
Set a modest target (5%) for savings on consultants	50	Invest in crossing patrols for schools which currently fall below the threshold for wardens, and where road safety conditions allow	33
Delete 2 senior manager posts (assume 6 months saving)	100		

Remove Leader's Policy Officer post	30
Cut to taxpayer subsidy to trade unions	363
Delete SRAs for Cabinet Advisors	45

The following savings schemes require the agreement of new contracts, or actions to be agreed with other bodies. Consequently the following investments are proposed conditionally on the successful implementation of these savings schemes.

Set a modest savings target for shared services with other Local Authorities in Sheffield City Region	100	Recruit more posts in Private Sector Housing team	250
Pay review - 5% reduction for staff on salaries between £39k and £80k (assume 6 months saving)	763	Devolve funds to the LAP for local members to commission activities	190
Pay review - 10% reduction for staff on a salary of >£80k (assume 6 months saving)	150	Make city centre parking free on Sundays and evenings	241
		Reverse cut in fly tipping and graffiti contract budget	9
		Professional librarian support for associate libraries	123
		Increase grant to Citizen's Advice Bureau	50
		Increase funding for the Environmental Enforcement team for a "Clean Up Sheffield" task force with target of 20% recovery via fines for littering, fly tipping and dog fouling	150
<b>Savings total</b>	<b>1,745</b>	<b>Investments total</b>	<b>1,745</b>

**CAPITAL BUDGET**

<b>Savings</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Investments / spending options</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Use of uncommitted Growth Investment Fund	2,000	Creation of a "Greener Neighbourhoods Fund" to be devolved to local communities to be allocated via the LAP (funded by Growth Investment Fund)	985
Use of unutilised fund for bringing empty shops back into use	185	Regeneration projects for Hillsborough and Woodseats District Centre (funded by Growth Investment Fund)	500
		Top up Local Transport Fund to be allocated via the LAP	700
<b>Savings total</b>	<b>2,185</b>	<b>Investments total</b>	<b>2,185</b>

**LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN**

<b>Savings</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>Investments / spending proposals</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Nil		Re-allocate decision making over £1.4 million of transport funding away from Cabinet Member to local communities in a " to be allocated via the LAP	Cost neutral
<b>Savings total</b>	<b>Nil</b>	<b>Investments total</b>	<b>Nil</b>

- (17) notes those specific projects included in the years 2017/18 to 2022/23 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (16) 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;
- (18) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 6 years to 2022/23 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (16) above;
- (19) 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 2017/18 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;

- (20) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Acting Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2017/18, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph (16) above, as follows:-

<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>	<b><u>Summary Revenue Budget</u></b>	<b><u>Appendix 3</u></b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>Original Budget 2017/18</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
66,423	Children Young People and Families	66,262
136,587	Communities	140,911
129,101	Place	128,928
1,900	Policy Performance and Communications	1,740
52,224	Resources	52,299
<b>386,235</b>		<b>390,140</b>
	<b>Corporate Budgets:</b>	
	<b>Specific Grants</b>	
-74,601	PFI Grant	-74,437
-9,323	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,029
-1,490	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,467
-2,880	Small Business Rates Relief	-3,976
0	Improved Better Care Fund	-2,188
0	CCG Better Care Fund Income	-5,000
0	Adult Social Care Grant (2017/18 only)	-2,717
	<b>Corporate Items</b>	
8,200	Redundancy Provision	6,200
-18,846	Pension Costs	-13,567
8,405	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	7,029
-698	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
2,700	Independent Living Fund Pressure	0
4,555	Better Care Fund	3,000
0	Social Care Risk	2,000
0	Strengthening Families - Think Forward Investment	4,000
25,094	Schools and Howden PFI	25,285
600	Infrastructure Investment	900
27	Payment to Parish Councils	22

300	ICT Refresh	300
-9,300	Better Care Fund	0
80,100	Pension Deficit Payment	0
1,067	Other	1,523
	<b>Capital Financing Costs</b>	
23,681	General Capital Financing Costs	22,944
8,314	Highways PFI Capital Financing Costs	11,630
28,199	MSF Capital Financing Costs	18,844
	<b>Reserves Movements</b>	
-882	Contribution from Reserves	-7,604
-53,400	Reserves Movements Relating to Pension Early Payment	20,417
<b>406,057</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>395,551</b>
	<b>Financing of Net Expenditure</b>	
-90,592	Revenue Support Grant	-67,790
-106,131	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-96,746
-29,124	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-39,583
-176,467	Council Tax income	-182,116
-283	Collection Fund surplus	-398
-3,460	Social Care Precept	-8,918
<b>-406,057</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-395,551</b>

- (21) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (22) 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 (16) above;
- (23) notes the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position;
- (24) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (25) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (26) agrees that authority be delegated to the Acting Executive Director of Resources 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;

- (27) approves a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (16) above relating to salary reductions;
- (28) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 177 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (29) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (30) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £512,236 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (31) 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;
- (32) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £395.551m set out in paragraph (20) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, 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 2017/18 REVENUE**  
**BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2017, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
  - (a) for the whole council area as:  
**133,743.89** (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 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is:

£ **191,034,345** .

3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) £ **1,343,486,330** 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) £ **1,151,939,749** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) £ **191,546,581** 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) £ **1,432.1894** 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) £ **512,236** 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) £ **1,428.3595** 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 overleaf.
5. £ **8,918,499** 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 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

**Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96

**Bradfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Bradfield Parish Council	26.85	31.32	35.80	40.27	49.22	58.17	67.12	80.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51

**Ecclesfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.67	12.45	14.23	16.01	19.56	23.12	26.68	32.01
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97

**Stocksbridge Town Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.65	24.09	27.53	30.97	37.86	44.74	51.62	61.94
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

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 2017/18	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72



## Budget Council 03/03/17

South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96
Bradfield Parish Council	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

## **Appendix 6c**

Parish Council	2016/17					2017/18					
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Council Tax Increase
Bradfield	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	5,713.66	230,105	40,2727	8,004	238,109	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	9,149.98	146,466	16,0072	8,033	154,499	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	3,675.84	113,849	30,9724	5,779	119,629	2.00%
Total/average	18,417.19	476,153	25,8537	27,270	503,423	18,539.48	490,420	26,4527	21,816	12,236	2.32%

### 7.3.1 Motion to move to next business

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.13) the Council does now move to the next business and that the question be now put.

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

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

For the amendment (20) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq

Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley.

Against the amendment  
(61)

- Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained on the  
amendment (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

7.4 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2017, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (1) continues to condemn the cuts to local authority funding chosen by central government and applauds the efforts of politicians and campaigners calling for an alternative to the policy of enforced austerity;
- (2) notes that the Council - and consequently council services and Sheffield's citizens - has now endured a funding shortfall of £350 million since 2010;
- (3) thanks the officers of the Council, and in other organisations directly

affected by the austerity programme, in the way they have responded to the increasing cuts and made sacrifices;

- (4) notes, however, that some long-term, outsourced contracts with big private businesses have not taken an equivalent share of the cuts, with the Council reconsidering the 35-year waste management contract, and with the Streets Ahead contract requiring an additional £4.5 million this year alone;
- (5) 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 collected in local authorities' own areas, a move which will favour more affluent areas of the country;
- (6) believes that central Government has utterly failed to address the growing and substantial crisis in the care of older and disabled people and that, although the Government has chosen council tax rises to pay for social care, the sum raised is still inadequate to meet even the cost of living;
- (7) 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 we 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;
- (8) therefore, welcomes the Administration's proposal to raise the Council Tax hardship fund to £1 million to protect more of the 30,000 poorest families in the city, which is entirely in line with the Green Councillors' budget proposal in March 2016;
- (9) recognises the hard work of Sheffield citizens who have highlighted the economic risks attached to fossil fuels and the need for Sheffield City Council to do business ethically; and welcomes the inclusion in its Treasury Management Strategy, for the first time, commitments not to hold any direct investments in fossil fuels or companies involved in tax evasion or grave misconduct.
- (10) believes that the people of this city want a Council that listens to them, is accountable, and takes their genuinely-expressed concerns into account;
- (11) therefore, will open up Council meetings to public scrutiny by online web broadcasting;
- (12) will cut political spin from the Town Hall and will cut the posts of Group Policy Officers, requiring politicians to do their own research and press work;
- (13) will set an example by addressing income inequality between the

highest and lowest paid Council officers, closing the gap by reducing the pay of those on salaries over £50,000 a year;

- (14) will further reduce up to 2 posts in the HR Service to protect frontline services;
- (15) will reverse planned cuts to 3.5 full-time equivalent library staff;
- (16) will respond to the families, staff and carers at Hurlfield View respite centre for people with dementia by investing £400k to reinstate provision at Hurlfield View, recognising that this cannot be achieved in the short term, and in parallel will seek to cancel newly-let community-based contracts;
- (17) regrets the lost opportunity of a significant investment in jobs in the renewable energy industry when proposed in 2014; but will promote energy efficiency schemes in maintained schools by use of £500,000 unallocated New Homes Bonus funding;
- (18) will create further jobs by setting aside a further £500,000 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;
- (19) will take steps to increase the amount of council housing by funding a pilot of a small number of energy-efficient “container homes”, such as those already being pioneered in the city;
- (20) 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;
- (21) will also support an additional post to support standards in the private rented housing sector;
- (22) will develop proposals to introduce a workplace parking scheme, to improve air quality and generate further revenue for the city’s public transport investment;
- (23) will invest a substantial sum of £300,000 of unallocated Local Transport Plan funding into improving the numbers of Sheffield citizens getting to work by cycling or walking;
- (24) will reduce the price of parking permits to 2010 levels, by shifting the cost of parking in residential parking permit zones 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;

- (25) welcomes the new investment in replacing obsolete air quality monitoring stations and will further invest in public-facing visual displays on these, to ensure the public can see and monitor the measure of air pollution affecting them in real time;
- (26) will invest in a small discretionary grant fund to encourage zero or low-emission taxi vehicles through the licensing system;
- (27) wishes to 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;
- (28) will 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;
- (29) will support the safety of students and others in a vibrant city centre, by providing additional funding to extend a night bus service;
- (30) will work to prevent the causes of serious anti-social behaviour by reversing the proposal to cut residential drug and alcohol rehabilitation spaces;
- (31) will promote equality and the work of voluntary sector groups by reversing the £60,000 cut to the small-scale Equality & Fairness grant pot;
- (32) therefore requests the Acting Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/2018 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

**REVENUE BUDGET PROPOSAL**

Spending reductions	2017/18 (£'000)	Spending proposals	2017/18 (£'000)
Remove all group policy officer posts	89	Reverse cut in libraries staff	98
Removal of further 2 posts in HR	46	Maintain funding for Equality & Fairness grants	60
Use of New Homes Bonus (to fund enforcement officer to bring empty homes back into use)	37	Additional enforcement officer post to bring empty homes back into use	37

Use of New Homes Bonus (to fund additional post in Private Sector Housing)	26	Additional post in Private Sector Housing	26
		Reverse cut to residential drug/alcohol rehabilitation	50
		Webcasting of all Full Council, Budget & Scrutiny meetings	30
		Development of Workplace Parking Levy scheme	100
		Feasibility study into late night levy scheme	25
		Establish discretionary fund for grants to encourage zero or low-emission taxi vehicles	5
Introduce 20p increase to on-street parking fees in residential peripheral parking zones (PPZs)	369	Parking permit fees reduced to 2010 levels	297
		Revenue contribution to capital scheme (air quality monitoring stations)	19
<b>Savings - subtotal</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>Spending - subtotal</b>	<b>747</b>

The following savings schemes require the agreement of new contracts, or actions to be agreed with other bodies. Consequently the following investments are proposed conditionally on the successful implementation of these savings schemes.

Reduce pay on employees paid over £150,000 by 20% (assume 6 month saving)	25	Reinstate funding for Hurlfield View respite centre for dementia	400
Reduce pay on employees paid over £100,000 by 15% (assume 6 month saving)	63	Night bus	16
Reduce pay on employees paid over £50,000 by 10%	508		

(assume 6 month saving)

<b>Savings - subtotal</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>Spending - subtotal</b>	<b>416</b>
<b>Revenue saving sub-total</b>	<b>1,163</b>	<b>Revenue spending sub-total</b>	<b>1,163</b>

**CAPITAL BUDGET PROPOSAL**

Capital spending proposal (£'000)		Financing of capital proposals (£'000)	
20's Plenty City Centre scheme	262	Re-prioritise Local Transport Plan Programme set aside for 20mph speed limit schemes	262
Provision of public displays on air quality monitoring stations	50	Use of New Homes Bonus and revenue contribution to capital to fund provision of public displays on air quality monitoring stations	50
Additional walking and cycling infrastructure	300	Use of unallocated Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding	300
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
Fund to establish "container homes" pilot	250	Reprioritise funding for acquiring new council homes	250
<b>Capital spending total</b>	<b>1,862</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals total</b>	<b>1,862</b>

(33) notes those specific projects included in the years 2017/18 to 2022/23 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital

Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (32) 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;

- (34) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 6 years to 2022/23 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph (32) above;
- (35) 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 2017/18 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (36) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Acting Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2017/18, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph (32) above, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

**Summary Revenue Budget**

<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>		<b>Original Budget 2017/18</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
66,423	Children Young People and Families	66,072
136,587	Communities	140,578
129,101	Place	128,711
1,900	Policy Performance and Communications	1,883
<u>52,224</u>	Resources	<u>52,940</u>
<b>386,235</b>		<b>390,184</b>
	<b>Corporate Budgets:</b>	
	<b>Specific Grants</b>	
-74,601	PFI Grant	-74,437
-9,323	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,029
-1,490	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,467
-2,880	Small Business Rates Relief	-3,976
0	Improved Better Care Fund	-2,188
0	CCG Better Care Fund Income	-5,000
0	Adult Social Care Grant (2017/18 only)	-2,717



<b>Corporate Items</b>		
8,200	Redundancy Provision	6,200
-18,846	Pension Costs	-13,567
8,405	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	7,029
-698	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
2,700	Independent Living Fund Pressure	0
4,555	Better Care Fund	3,000
0	Social Care Risk	2,000
0	Strengthening Families - Think Forward Investment	4,000
25,094	Schools and Howden PFI	25,285
600	Infrastructure Investment	900
27	Payment to Parish Councils	22
300	ICT Refresh	300
-9,300	Better Care Fund	0
80,100	Pension Deficit Payment	0
0	Revenue Contribution to Capital	19
1,067	Other	1,523
<b>Capital Financing Costs</b>		
23,681	General Capital Financing Costs	22,944
8,314	Highways PFI Capital Financing Costs	11,630
28,199	MSF Capital Financing Costs	18,844
<b>Reserves Movements</b>		
-882	Contribution from Reserves	-7,667
-53,400	Reserves Movements Relating to Pension Early Payment	20,417
<b><u>406,057</u></b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b><u>395,551</u></b>
<b>Financing of Net Expenditure</b>		
-90,592	Revenue Support Grant	-67,790
-106,131	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-96,746
-29,124	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-39,583
-176,467	Council Tax income	-182,116
-283	Collection Fund surplus	-398
-3,460	Social Care Precept	-8,918
<b><u>-406,057</u></b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b><u>-395,551</u></b>

(37) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3% national arrangement for the social care precept);

(38) 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 (32) above;

- (39) notes the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position;
- (40) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (41) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (42) agrees that authority be delegated to the Acting Executive Director of Resources 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;
- (43) approves a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (32) above relating to the salary reductions;
- (44) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 177 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (45) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (46) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £512,236 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (47) 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;
- (48) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £395.551m set out in paragraph (36) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, 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 2017/18 REVENUE BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2017, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
  - (a) for the whole council area as:  
**133,743.89** (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 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
  
**£ 191,034,345 .**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£ 1,343,549,330** 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) **£ 1,152,002,749** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£ 191,546,581** 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) **£ 1,432.1894** 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) **£ 512,236** 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) **£ 1,428.3595** 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 overleaf.

5. £ **8,918,499** 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 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

**Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96

**Bradfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Bradfield Parish Council	26.85	31.32	35.80	40.27	49.22	58.17	67.12	80.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51

**Ecclesfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.67	12.45	14.23	16.01	19.56	23.12	26.68	32.01
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97

**Stocksbridge Town Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.65	24.09	27.53	30.97	37.86	44.74	51.62	61.94
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

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 2017/18	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96
Bradfield Parish Council	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

**Appendix 6c**

Parish Council	2016/17					2017/18					
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Council Tax Increase
Bradfield	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	5,713.66	230,105	40,2727	8,004	238,109	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	9,149.98	146,466	16,0072	8,033	154,499	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,665.37	111,299	30,3651	7,224	118,524	3,675.84	113,849	30,9724	5,779	119,629	2.00%
Total/average	18,417.19	476,153	25,8537	27,270	503,423	18,539.48	490,420	26,4527	21,816	12,236	2.32%

7.4.1 Motion to move to next business

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.13) the Council does now move to the next business and that the question be now put.

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

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

For the amendment (4) - Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal.

Against the amendment (76) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained on the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

7.5 It was then moved by Councillor Jack Clarkson, seconded by Councillor John Booker, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on

15<sup>th</sup> February, 2017, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (1) regrets the high level of council taxes imposed by this Council on local people as a result of cuts that the Government is imposing on local authorities in respect of social care;
- (2) believes the working poor and their families are under attack like never before and are losing the battle; these issues and related problems are a direct result of austerity policies perpetrated by the current and previous governments, and the poorest in society are now bearing the majority of the cuts and the Government is shifting its debt onto them, creating more hardship and reducing state services to the neediest in our society;
- (3) regrets the total Quantitative Easing package so far in the UK is £435billion, creating long term inflation, bringing more hardship to the citizens of this country, and notes that this printed money is directed to the financial markets, perpetuating the theme of the poor get poorer and the rich get richer;
- (4) believes this money should be spent in the real economy to benefit the whole of society, social care, the NHS, rough sleepers and the homeless, helping to fight drug addiction and alcohol-related problems, prisons, schools and a long-term plan to re-nationalise the railways, utilities and services;
- (5) welcomes the fact that by the end of this Parliament, councils will be able to retain all monies raised through business rates, and urges that this process be speeded up to offset the cuts in Revenue Support Grant;
- (6) believes after Brexit, Britain's contribution of £13billion annually to the European Union would be better spent protecting front line services from the Government's spending cuts and that only by leaving the EU and restoring self-governance can we ensure that our public services will be adequately funded in future years;
- (7) believes that the £52billion (and rising) that 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 adequate existing transport infrastructure and high speed broadband;
- (8) is again concerned by what it believes to be the exorbitant prices charged for some work carried out under the strategic preferred partnership contracts and believes that the tax payer of Sheffield would be better served by bringing a number of these services back in-house;

- (9) believes that Sheffield City Councillors and Council executives must not be immune from savings, and proposes, especially in light of the Administration's rising Council Tax hike, that they should set an example by making the following changes to pay and allowances:-
- (i) all Members to forego the 1% uplift to Member's Allowances recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel;
  - (ii) reduce Members' Basic Allowance by a 5% cut;
  - (iii) a 10% cut in Special Responsibility Allowances (SRA) paid to eligible Members and the abolition of the Cabinet Advisor SRA; and
  - (iv) a 10% cut in the salary of any Council employee paid over £100,000 p.a.;
- (10) proposes to use part of the £692,000 New Homes Bonus (NHB) to fund a new commercial waste disposal scheme at household waste recycling centres; where tradespersons will be charged a £20 fee to empty a transit size van/trailer; and also proposes to increase opening hours at all household recycling sites to accommodate the new scheme; this will assist local tradespeople to easily dispose of non-hazardous trade waste and will also reduce instances of fly tipping around the city, which draws heavily on the funds of other Council departments;
- (11) proposes to introduce environmental enhancements by:-
- (i) moving the pest control service to a fully self-financing model, whilst retaining discounts for people on qualifying benefits; and
  - (ii) discouraging fly tipping and poor refuse management practices, by:-
    - (A) employing an additional one enforcement and educational officer post, with a communications budget, to target areas prone to fly tipping; and
    - (B) introducing a mobile CCTV van to patrol areas prone to fly tipping and two staff to ensure enforcement, and in relation to CCTV, providing 'RIPA' signage to ensure legal regulatory compliance by the Council in respect of surveillance carried out;
- (12) proposes to use part of the £692,000 NHB to fund and support community and voluntary sector bodies wishing to run pop-up gyms and dementia groups in community centres and local venues;
- (13) proposes to make further savings by cutting 10% from the translation and interpretation budget as soon as possible;



- (14) proposes to further fund homeless prevention by providing 20 extra units a week accommodation for rough sleepers;
- (15) therefore requests the Acting Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/2018 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

**REVENUE BUDGET PROPOSAL**

Savings proposals	2017/18 (£'000)	Spending proposals	2017/18 (£'000)
<i>Permanent reductions in spending:</i>		<i>Permanent addition to budget:</i>	
Forego 1% uplift to Members' Allowance	14	1 additional enforcement & education officer post with communications budget to target areas prone to fly-tipping	72
Reduce Members' Basic Allowances by 5%	49	Establish fund to support community and voluntary sector bodies wishing to run pop-up gyms and dementia groups	30
Reduce Members' Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) by 10%, and scrap SRAs for Cabinet Advisors	63	Introduce mobile CCTV van to patrol areas prone to fly-tipping	88
Pest Control service to become fully self-financing	111	Increase capacity of accommodation for rough sleepers via existing contract (20 extra units per week)	49
Introduce charging policy for non-statutory translation & interpreting services to generate 10% saving	25		
<b>Savings - subtotal</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>Spending proposals - subtotal</b>	<b>239</b>

The following savings schemes require the agreement of new contracts, or actions to be agreed with other bodies. Consequently the following investments are proposed conditionally on the successful implementation of these savings schemes.

Income from charging £20 for commercial waste disposal at household waste recycling centres	239	Increase opening hours to 7 days a week at all household waste recycling centres to accommodate new commercial waste disposal scheme, and increase in costs relating to new waste stream – to be reviewed on an annual basis	979
---	-----	--	-----

Use of time limited funding (New Homes Bonus) to subsidise the proposed new service regarding commercial waste disposal

662

Reduce pay on employees paid over £100,000 by 10% (assume 6 month saving)

55

<b>Savings - subtotal</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>Spending proposals - subtotal</b>	<b>979</b>
---------------------------	------------	--------------------------------------	------------

<b>Revenue saving total</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>Revenue spending sub-total</b>	<b>1,218</b>
-----------------------------	--------------	-----------------------------------	--------------

**CAPITAL BUDGET PROPOSAL**

Capital spending proposal	(£'000)	Financing of capital proposals	(£'000)
---------------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---------

Upgrade all household waste recycling centres to prepare for commercial waste scheme	30	Use of New Homes Bonus	30
--	----	------------------------	----

<b>Capital spending total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>Financing of capital proposals total</b>	<b>30</b>
-------------------------------	-----------	---	-----------

- (16) notes those specific projects included in the years 2017/18 to 2022/23 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 6 years to 2022/23 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 2017/18 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 Acting Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2017/18, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph (15) above, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>	<b><u>Summary Revenue Budget</u></b>	<b>Original Budget 2017/18</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
66,423	Children Young People and Families	66,231
136,587	Communities	140,130
129,101	Place	129,521
1,900	Policy Performance and Communications	1,879
52,224	Resources	53,041
<b>386,235</b>		<b>390,802</b>
	<b>Corporate Budgets:</b>	
	<b>Specific Grants</b>	
-74,601	PFI Grant	-74,437
-9,323	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,029
-1,490	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,467

-2,880	Small Business Rates Relief	-3,976
0	Improved Better Care Fund	-2,188
0	CCG Better Care Fund Income	-5,000
0	Adult Social Care Grant (2017/18 only)	-2,717
<b>Corporate Items</b>		
8,200	Redundancy Provision	6,200
-18,846	Pension Costs	-13,567
8,405	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	7,029
-698	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
2,700	Independent Living Fund Pressure	0
4,555	Better Care Fund	3,000
0	Social Care Risk	2,000
0	Strengthening Families - Think Forward Investment	4,000
25,094	Schools and Howden PFI	25,285
600	Infrastructure Investment	900
27	Payment to Parish Councils	22
300	ICT Refresh	300
-9,300	Better Care Fund	0
80,100	Pension Deficit Payment	0
1,067	Other	1,523
<b>Capital Financing Costs</b>		
23,681	General Capital Financing Costs	22,944
8,314	Highways PFI Capital Financing Costs	11,630
28,199	MSF Capital Financing Costs	18,844
<b>Reserves Movements</b>		
-882	Contribution from Reserves	-8,266
-53,400	Reserves Movements Relating to Pension Early Payment	20,417
<b><u>406,057</u></b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b><u>395,551</u></b>
<b>Financing of Net Expenditure</b>		
-90,592	Revenue Support Grant	-67,790
-106,131	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-96,746
-29,124	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-39,583
-176,467	Council Tax income	-182,116
-283	Collection Fund surplus	-398
-3,460	Social Care Precept	-8,918
<b><u>-406,057</u></b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b><u>-395,551</u></b>

- (20) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3% 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 2016/17 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 Acting Executive Director of Resources 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) approves a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph (15) above relating to salary reductions;
- (27) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 177 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (28) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (29) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £512,236 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (30) 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;
- (31) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £395.551m set out in paragraph (19) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, 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 2017/18 REVENUE**  
**BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2017, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
  - (a) for the whole council area as:  
**133,743.89** (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 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 191,034,345 .**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£ 1,344,148,330** 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) **£ 1,152,601,749** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£ 191,546,581** 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) **£ 1,432.1894** 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) **£ 512,236** 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) £ **1,428.3595** 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 overleaf.
5. £ **8,918,499** 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 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

**Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96

**Bradfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Bradfield Parish Council	26.85	31.32	35.80	40.27	49.22	58.17	67.12	80.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51

**Ecclesfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.67	12.45	14.23	16.01	19.56	23.12	26.68	32.01
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97

**Stocksbridge Town Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.65	24.09	27.53	30.97	37.86	44.74	51.62	61.94
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

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 2017/18	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96
Bradfield Parish Council	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

**Appendix 6c**

**Parish Council Precepts**

Parish Council	2016/17					2017/18					
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Council Tax Increase
Bradfield	5,663.47	223,611	39,4831	10,005	233,616	5,713.66	230,105	40,2727	8,004	238,109	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,088.35	141,242	15,5410	10,041	151,283	9,149.98	146,466	16,0072	8,033	154,499	3.00%



## Budget Council 03/03/17

Stocksbridge	3,665.37	111,299	30.3651	7,224	118,524	3,675.84	113,849	30.9724	5,779	119,629	2.00%
Total/average	18,417.19	476,153	25.8537	27,270	503,423	18,539.48	490,420	26.4527	21,816	512,236	2.32%

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

7.5.2 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 (77) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Craig Gamble Pugh, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained on the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (1) 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 cuts to staffing numbers;
- (2) regrets that since 2010, central government funding to Sheffield City Council has been decimated, and notes that government funding is reducing, meaning the Council has to find £40m worth of savings for the financial year;
- (3) notes the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement details the change in core spending power for Sheffield amounts to a reduction of 2.0% (compared to the England average of 1.1%) from 2016/17 to 2017/18;
- (4) notes that £40million worth of savings is needed to be made from the Council's budget for the next year, and is in addition to the £350m of savings already made since the formation of the Liberal Democrat-Conservative coalition government in 2010;
- (5) 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 2017/18 budget was estimated to be the third year that the cuts were over;
- (6) believes that the fact that the Council now faces further cuts over the coming year(s) is a damning indictment of the failure of the previous coalition government to eliminate the deficit, despite inflicting unprecedented cuts to public services and that Labour's growth-led recovery would have cut the deficit at a much quicker rate;
- (7) regrets that the current government are continuing with the same failed policies of the previous coalition government; continuing to cut local government services to the bone, whilst at the same time implementing policies which only benefit the very wealthy, such as raising the threshold for inheritance tax and increasing the 40p income tax band;
- (8) believes that Councils are bearing the brunt of an austerity programme in its seventh year; it is, as such, this Council's contention that the continuation of austerity is a political choice by the Government based on their ideological commitment to shrinking the state, rather than an economic imperative, a belief shared by the Liberal Democrats who went along with this at every step of the way when in coalition government;
- (9) believes that the Labour Party is right to call to an immediate end the unnecessary and deeply damaging austerity programme devised by the Coalition Government and now continued by the incumbent Government and notes that the Labour Party is united in its total opposition of this;

- (10) notes that in addition to the cuts being forced on local authorities, the increasing external pressures such as an ageing population and increased demand for services at an increased cost, and the current crisis in adult social care, is making it harder and harder for councils to balance their budgets and provide the desired services;
- (11) believes that the current crisis in social care has reached a “breaking point”, but that this crisis has been seven years in the making as government funding to services have become more sparse;
- (12) notes that the Council spends a significant portion of its budget on adult social care but that, due to increasing pressures, it is getting harder to provide the necessary services for adult social care, and that this is in part due to external factors such as an ageing population and increased demands for services at an increased cost;
- (13) highlights that in addition to the increasing pressure on services, central government grants and funding are being reduced and this has resulted in an increasing “budget gap”, and this is projected to have grown to £116 million by 2021/22;
- (14) 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;
- (15) believes that due to the magnitude of government cuts over the past seven years and increased pressure on services, it was unavoidable that the Council would seek to put up Council Tax;
- (16) further believes it is unavoidable to implement the Chancellor’s social care “precept” of three per cent as outlined in the 2015 Spending Review and Autumn Statement;
- (17) notes that whilst the Government have promised not to increase taxes, it is in effect forcing local authorities to do this work for them, with councils needing to increase Council Tax in order to try to plug the shortfall in finances caused by increasing pressures and the reductions in central government grants;
- (18) believes that the three per cent Council Tax precept for social care does not even fully cover the Council’s need to pay providers properly so they can fulfil their obligations to pay staff the National Living Wage, and that the precept is not enough to stem the funding crisis;
- (19) makes an additional point on the above in regard to social care, that despite the short-term financial pressures caused by the introduction of the National Living Wage, it may have a positive impact on our local care

market by driving up the attractiveness of working in the sector and therefore increasing the security and stability of our providers (which in turn may then require less intervention on the Council's part), and notes that the Labour Party is committed to an actual National Living Wage (as determined by the independent Living Wage Foundation) rather than the higher rate of minimum wage we currently have and, additionally, this Administration contends that we are not in funding crisis because of the need to pay care workers a decent wage but because of more systemic problems;

- (20) notes that for 2017/18, the additional £5.4m raised through the social care precept still leaves the Council needing to find a further £35m, including a revenue support grant (RSG) cut of £23m, and that the precept fails to address the increased cost of providing social care alone, and believes that the real issues the Government must address is the lack of funding for local authorities and the need to tackle the social care crisis, however, this Administration believes it would be irresponsible not to use this funding to protect care services as far as possible and this is why we are doing so;
- (21) reinstates its support to calls for the Government to provide emergency funds of £700 million into social care to help stem the funding crisis, and states its disappointment that the Government are so far unwilling to grant this request despite it clearly being required;
- (22) notes that most local authorities are facing similar difficulties to meet the rising social care pressures; exemplified by Surrey Council originally proposing to hold a referendum on increasing Council Tax by 15% in order to meet their social care costs, and believes that this was only dropped after a deal, seemingly made in secret, was forged by the Government and the Conservative-run Surrey Council to provide additional central government funding to spare the Government any embarrassment;
- (23) believes it is incredulous that a special deal for Surrey Council seems to have been agreed by the Government behind closed doors and this Council questions whether the Government have finally recognised that local government is grossly underfunded, as seen by their "special deal" to Surrey; and that the Government should recognise that there will be a £2.6bn shortfall in social care funding by 2020;
- (24) contends that if a deal was struck, Government Ministers should offer the same deal given to Surrey to all councils, regardless of political affiliation;
- (25) believes we have a crisis in social care, resulting from the Coalition Government's cuts to local authority funding and the continuation of these cuts by the present Government, and that secret backroom deals are not the answer as we urgently need a proper solution and to provide councils with the funding they need to solve this crisis;

- (26) notes the similarities of the Government's 2016 £300 million relief fund, whereby Sheffield received nothing, yet the vast majority of funding went to Conservative-controlled areas; the largest beneficiary was Surrey, getting £24m, whilst £19m went 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;
- (27) acknowledges that the Government has provided a new Adult Social Care Support Grant of £241m nationally, but that it is only available for 2017/18 and this Council believes the Grant is beyond feeble in its attempt to meet the required funding level; the Adult Social Care Support Grant allocates funding according to the Social Care needs formula, which does not take into account the ability to raise funds through the social care precept, and is financed from a reduced New Homes Bonus allocation; this new grant is estimated to only provide additional funding of £2.7m to Sheffield and is a temporary measure for one year only; making it a small help in the short-term but it is completely inadequate to cover the financial shortfall and provides no longer term benefits;
- (28) reinstates that this Administration is committed to helping those who are struggling to pay for Council Tax and will renew last year's Council Tax Support Scheme, which last year helped over 52,000 households, and will continue to call for the Government to reintroduce a fully funded council tax benefit scheme;
- (29) believes that the Administration's continuation of the Council Tax Support Scheme shows that only a Labour council can be trusted to make sure that tax rises are not "balanced on the backs of the poor" and notes that this is in stark contrast to the actions of the Liberal Democrats in coalition government who raised VAT and slashed disability benefits, affecting most the very poorest, whilst at the same time reducing the top-rate of tax for the very wealthiest;
- (30) reaffirms the Administration's housing strategy, as set out in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), and commitment to social housing; highlighting that despite the challenging financial climate, the Authority is almost one third of the way toward its target of 1,000 extra council homes; with a switch of focus from acquisitions to new build with no overall increase in the cost of the programme, and that a higher percentage of new builds within the programme will help us to build the mix of housing that we need and we will continue to deliver, as planned, improvements to our tenants' homes to make sure they continue to be well maintained over the next 5 years;
- (31) notes that as a result of budget cuts, the Council could lose up to 225

jobs during the financial year 2017/18; and that this Administration, as in previous years, will take steps to minimise redundancies, such as offering voluntary severance and voluntary early retirement schemes, as well as using vacancies not yet filled;

- (32) expresses sincere and heartfelt sympathy to those members of staff who are losing their jobs through redundancy and regrets that the Government's cuts and austerity programme has made redundancies unavoidable;
- (33) believes that despite the difficulties, this Administration has provided six years of progress for the city and is committed to bringing about positive changes for the people of Sheffield; improving living standards for all and driving up growth for our local economy; as such we welcome the exciting developments of the Sheffield Retail Quarter and new investment into the city region from McLaren and Boeing and will constantly seek to build on our successes;
- (34) therefore requests the Acting Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/2018 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted;
- (35) notes those specific projects included in the years 2017/18 to 2022/23 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;
- (36) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 6 years to 2022/23 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme;
- (37) 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 2017/18 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve;
- (38) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Acting Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2017/18, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2017/18 amounting to £395.551m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, as follows:-

**Appendix 3**

**Summary Revenue Budget**

<b>Original Budget 2016/17</b>		<b>Original Budget 2017/18</b>
<b>£000</b>		<b>£000</b>
	<b>Portfolio budgets:</b>	
66,423	Children Young People and Families	66,239
136,587	Communities	140,061
129,101	Place	128,742
1,900	Policy Performance and Communications	1,898
52,224	Resources	53,200
<hr/> <b>386,235</b>		<hr/> <b>390,140</b>
	<b>Corporate Budgets:</b>	
	<b>Specific Grants</b>	
-74,601	PFI Grant	-74,437
-9,323	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,029
-1,490	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,467
-2,880	Small Business Rates Relief	-3,976
0	Improved Better Care Fund	-2,188
0	CCG Better Care Fund Income	-5,000
0	Adult Social Care Grant (2017/18 only)	-2,717
	<b>Corporate Items</b>	
8,200	Redundancy Provision	6,200
-18,846	Pension Costs	-13,567
8,405	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	7,029
-698	Public Health Savings / re-investments	-698
2,700	Independent Living Fund Pressure	0
4,555	Better Care Fund	3,000
0	Social Care Risk	2,000
0	Strengthening Families - Think Forward Investment	4,000
25,094	Schools and Howden PFI	25,285
600	Infrastructure Investment	900
27	Payment to Parish Councils	22
300	ICT Refresh	300
-9,300	Better Care Fund	0
80,100	Pension Deficit Payment	0
1,067	Other	1,523
	<b>Capital Financing Costs</b>	
23,681	General Capital Financing Costs	22,944
8,314	Highways PFI Capital Financing Costs	11,630
28,199	MSF Capital Financing Costs	18,844
	<b>Reserves Movements</b>	
-882	Contribution from Reserves	-7,604
-53,400	Reserves Movements Relating to Pension Early Payment	20,417

<b>406,057</b>	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>395,551</b>
	<b>Financing of Net Expenditure</b>	
-90,592	Revenue Support Grant	-67,790
-106,131	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-96,746
-29,124	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-39,583
-176,467	Council Tax income	-182,116
-283	Collection Fund surplus	-398
-3,460	Social Care Precept	-8,918
<b>-406,057</b>	<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>-395,551</b>

- (39) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,428.36 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 4.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 3% national arrangement for the social care precept);
- (40) 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;
- (41) notes the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position;
- (42) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (43) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (44) agrees that authority be delegated to the Acting Executive Director of Resources 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;
- (45) approves a Pay Policy for 2017/18 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (46) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2017/18 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 177 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (47) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and further details can be found in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;



- (48) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £512,236 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (49) notes the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;
- (50) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £395.551m set out in paragraph (38) above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2017/18, 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 2017/18 REVENUE BUDGET**

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2017, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2017/18
  - (a) for the whole council area as:  
**133,743.89** (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 2017/18 (excluding Parish precepts) is:  
**£ 191,034,345 .**
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
  - (a) **£ 1,343,486,330** 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) **£ 1,151,939,749** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
  - (c) **£ 191,546,581** 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) £ **1,432.1894** 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) £ **512,236** 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) £ **1,428.3595** 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 overleaf.
5. £ **8,918,499** 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 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

### Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	<u>1,103.65</u>	<u>1,287.60</u>	<u>1,471.54</u>	<u>1,655.48</u>	<u>2,023.36</u>	<u>2,391.25</u>	<u>2,759.13</u>	<u>3,310.96</u>

### Bradfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Bradfield Parish Council	26.85	31.32	35.80	40.27	49.22	58.17	67.12	80.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	<u>1,130.50</u>	<u>1,318.92</u>	<u>1,507.34</u>	<u>1,695.75</u>	<u>2,072.58</u>	<u>2,449.42</u>	<u>2,826.25</u>	<u>3,391.51</u>

**Ecclesfield Parish Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.67	12.45	14.23	16.01	19.56	23.12	26.68	32.01
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97

**Stocksbridge Town Council**

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
Stocksbridge Town Council	20.65	24.09	27.53	30.97	37.86	44.74	51.62	61.94
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

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 2017/18	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	952.24	1,110.95	1,269.65	1,428.36	1,745.77	2,063.19	2,380.60	2,856.72
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	45.97	53.64	61.30	68.96	84.28	99.61	114.93	137.92
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	105.44	123.01	140.59	158.16	193.31	228.45	263.60	316.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,103.65	1,287.60	1,471.54	1,655.48	2,023.36	2,391.25	2,759.13	3,310.96
Bradfield Parish Council	1,130.50	1,318.92	1,507.34	1,695.75	2,072.58	2,449.42	2,826.25	3,391.51
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,114.32	1,300.05	1,485.77	1,671.49	2,042.92	2,414.37	2,785.81	3,342.97
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,124.30	1,311.69	1,499.07	1,686.45	2,061.22	2,435.99	2,810.75	3,372.90

**Appendix 6c**

Parish Council	2016/17					2017/18					
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precept	Council Tax Increase
Bradfield	5,663.47	223,611	39.4831	10,005	233,616	5,713.66	230,105	40.2727	8,004	238,109	2.00%
Ecclesfield	9,088.35	141,242	15.5410	10,041	151,283	9,149.98	146,466	16.0072	8,033	154,499	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,665.37	111,299	30.3651	7,224	118,524	3,675.84	113,849	30.9724	5,779	119,629	2.00%
Total/average	18,417.19	476,153	25.8537	27,270	503,423	18,539.48	490,420	26.4527	21,816	12,236	2.32%

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

For the Substantive Motion (52) - Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Substantive Motion (28) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David

Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.

Abstained on the Substantive Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

## **8. MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES 2017/18 AND ONWARD**

8.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the report of the Acting Executive Director, Resources commenting on and appending the report of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel, dated January 2017, and thanks the members of the Panel for their report;
- (b) having regard to the recommendations contained in the Panel's report, together with the information contained in the report of the Acting Executive Director, Resources, approves and adopts from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017 and onwards, a Members' Allowances Scheme comprising the arrangements approved and adopted by the City Council for the years 2013/14 to 2016/17, unchanged; and
- (c) (i) as regards the annual index-linked increase, confirms that, as in previous years, the annual index in relation to Basic, Special Responsibility (including the Pensions Authority), Co-optees and Dependent Carers' Allowances shall be the average percentage officer pay award in Sheffield, and in relation to travel and subsistence, the annual index shall be the relevant officer rates agreed from time to time; such arrangements to be implemented for a period of four years and (ii) in line with the recommendation of the Independent Remuneration Panel, agrees to implement the annual increase during 2017/18 in relation to Basic, Special Responsibility (including the Pensions Authority), Co-optees and Dependent Carers' Allowances, the first such increase in 7 years, with provision having been made in the Council's Revenue Budget for 2017/18 to accommodate a 1% uplift on those Allowances.

8.1.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraph (a) and against paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (c)(i) and voted against paragraph (c)(ii) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

This page is intentionally left blank