

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

PRESENT

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

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

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Denise Reaney, Jillian Creasy, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Janice Sidebottom and Clive Skelton.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Notice of Motion number 8 (concerning changes to Council Tax Discounts for Second Homes and Empty Properties)

Councillor Colin Ross – owner of a second property

Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed – owner of a second home

Councillor Leigh Bramall – owner of a second home

Councillor Mazher Iqbal – owner of a second home

Councillor Talib Hussain – owner of a second home

Councillor Ibrar Hussain – owner of an empty property

2.2 Notice of Motion number 11 (concerning Food Banks)

Councillor Ben Curran declared a personal interest because he is a Trustee of Ben's Centre.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 23 January 2013 be approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

(a) Petition Opposing the Council's Budget Cuts

The Council received a petition containing 364 signatures opposing the Council's budget cuts.

On behalf of the petitioners, Richard Brown addressed the Council and made reference to a comment previously made by the Leader of the Council concerning the Council's future role and responsibilities, which might be reduced to delivering its statutory duties and waste collection. He asked, if the Council was acknowledging the affect of the funding reductions, why was it implementing them? He referred to the cuts to frontline services, which would have a real effect on people and to the likelihood of the budget reductions continuing until 2018. He asked the Council to oppose the funding cuts from Government, which he believed had a weak mandate and stated that he believed that authorities in the north of the Country might co-ordinate their opposition to the cuts in opposition to the

Government.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore). Councillor Dore stated that she would respond to some of the wide range of issues which Mr Brown had raised on behalf of the petitioners. She said that, as a Councillor elected to serve the people of Sheffield, it was her job to set a balanced budget for the Council. It was not possible for the Council to raise all of the income that it needed locally and the Council was dependent upon funding from central Government.

(b) Petition Requesting that the Council saves Highfield Adventure Playground

The Council received a petition containing 2446 signatures, requesting that the Council saves Highfield Adventure Playground.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Lucinda Wakefield. She stated that the playground was a very valuable resource in Sharrow and was used by many children, young people and parents and the proposal to cease provision at the playground would have consequences for children and young people and families. She asked for more support in helping to maintain the playground, which was a place of safety and of significant value to both young people and parents. Older children, many of whom were vulnerable, used the playground in the evenings and it protected and prevented young people from involvement in anti-social behaviour. She stated that she believed that Council had not properly consulted before reaching a decision on this issue and asked that other potential areas of financial savings be considered. She also made reference to the Fairness Commission guideline that those in greatest need should take priority.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and Sport (Councillor Isobel Bowler). Councillor Bowler stated that the Council had been consulting with the Friends of Adventures and other community groups in relation to the playground. There were two other facilities in Burngreave also affected by the proposals. The Council recognised the value of the playgrounds, but was required to make significant savings this year. Proposals had to be made that no one thought or hoped would need to be considered. Activity Sheffield was reducing its budget by 30 percent and the proposals affected the three staffed facilities and subsidised swimming and diving. It was proposed to retain investment in mobile teams so that a service for the areas of need could be maintained.

Councillor Bowler said that she respected, understood and agreed with much of what had been said by Lucinda Wakefield in presenting the petition and stated that a number of agencies worked with young people and discussions were taking place with them as to whether activities could continue to be delivered from the adventure playgrounds.

4.2 Public Questions

(a) Public Questions on Council policy on cuts to services, the use of the Council's Reserves

(i) Kristopher Barker asked whether the Council would stand up for the people of Sheffield and join a group of Labour Councillors from Hull, Southampton and other Authorities and named "Councillors Against Cuts" and whose members had promised to vote against cutting services?

(ii) Joe Daviney asked, under what circumstances would the Labour Council oppose cuts in public services?

(iii) Sam Morecroft asked why the Council was unwilling to use the £168 million in Council Reserves as a barrier to protect services, using borrowing powers, if necessary, and the forging of links with other Councils around the country to campaign to protect all services and oppose all cuts?

(iv) Peter Hartley asked, in light of the Council's unsuccessful attempts to secure more funding from the Government, whether Councillors would oppose and defy the Government along the lines of the action taken by Councillors at the former Clay Cross Urban District Council in the early 1970s?

(v) Emrana Khatun referred to the fact that she was a first year student at Sheffield Hallam University and asked, in light of the proposed cuts, how the Council expected students to find jobs at the end of their degree courses?

Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources) responded that the Council could not act as martyrs and set an illegal budget which would fail to meet legal requirements for the setting of a balanced budget, then the Government would intervene and set a budget on behalf of the Council with the effect that financial control of the Council's affairs would be taken out of the Council's control. He added that the Council faced very difficult choices in terms of resource allocation and its effects on those receiving and those delivering Council services and but nevertheless had to take such decisions. He challenged the questioners to identify how the Council might manage a situation in which it had set a budget that was inadequate for maintaining services at their current level.

Councillor Lodge stated that all Members of the Council had been elected by the public to represent them and were charged, therefore, with managing the public purse in the context of a further £50 million of cuts in 2013/14 in addition to approximately £140 million of cuts made over the previous two years. These were deep cuts and the Council was attempting to fight them wherever possible, but the Council had to set a balanced budget for 2013/14 in order to ensure that the funding of services that the Council had agreed would be provided, was adequate.

As far as the use of Council Reserves was concerned, Councillor Lodge indicated that it was correct that the Council had approximately £168 million of Reserves but that the vast majority of these had already been set aside for amongst other things, the Building Schools for the Future Programme and Highways Private Finance Initiative, leaving approximately £11 million of Reserves for dealing with unexpected emergencies, such as the flooding the City experienced in 2007. He added that if the option to borrow to fund services was available and provided a simple solution to the Council's problems, then the Council, like other Authorities, would take this course of action. However, this was not a sensible approach to managing the

Council's budget and one which the Council's Financial Officers would not support as a sustainable option.

In responding to the question raised concerning the availability of work for students following the completion of their degree courses, Councillor Lodge acknowledged the very difficult circumstances that students found themselves in when looking for work and that there needed to be a further Government drive to support business and enterprise to grow nationally and to create more employment opportunities. The Council had established the Keep Sheffield Working Fund under which the Council was working with the City's universities to find employment opportunities for graduates. The Council, amongst other things, was assisting local businesses to identify export markets, providing Business Start-Up loans to help young people start businesses and creating a 200 Apprenticeship Programme, which would seek to help, amongst others, those young people who were not in employment, education or training (NEETS).

Councillor Lodge stated that the Council recognised the importance of getting more people into jobs, but believed that the questions above should be directed to the Government and suggested that the main opposition group on the Council should take up the issues raised in the questions with Mr. Nick Clegg, M.P.

(b) Public Question relating to Public inquiry into NHS Hospitals

Adam Butcher asked, in light of the recent public inquiry, of the mid-Staffordshire Hospital and other hospitals, how did the Labour Administration plan to protect people in Sheffield so that similar situations referred to in the Inquiry's report did not occur in Sheffield.

Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living) responded that whilst she had not read the report she understood that it was pretty damning which showed that the care of vulnerable people in the mid-Staffordshire hospital had put patients' health and well-being at serious risk with patients being left without fluids and nutrition and where there were serious lessons to be learnt for the NHS and local authorities nationally.

Sheffield had experienced care problems in certain institutions in the past and the Council had examined the reports on the serious abuse experienced by patients at Winterbourne View and that the perpetrators of such abuse had received prison sentences. She believed that where institutions had a responsibility for the care of people there was a need for the utmost openness and transparency and adherence to a strictly enforced value system. Sheffield needed to examine the implications of the report for the delivery of health and care services in Sheffield, working closely with the NHS hospitals to ensure care for vulnerable people accords with what they need. She acknowledged that Sheffield's hospitals delivered hi-tech, excellent care for the most part but the Council and NHS needed to ensure that they worked together more effectively than ever to ensure that standards of care were maintained.

(c) Public Question on car parking restrictions on Argyle Road/Close

Trevor Eggington asked why there were no parking restrictions on Argyle Close, when there were full day parking restrictions on Argyle Road. Mr Eggington asked whether it would be possible to have temporary parking restriction signs on the Carfield School side on Argyle Close?

Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) responded that the City Council supported the South Yorkshire Police campaign in the south of the City to improve school safety by ensuring parking restrictions were complied with and enforced in the most appropriate way in order that it did not impact on residents disproportionately. The Cabinet Highways Committee would shortly receive a report on parking issues on Argyle Close/Road and he would be happy to speak to officers in order to see if a better solution could be found. Councillor Bramall indicated that he would also inform Mr Eggington of the progress made on the matter and the date when it would be discussed by the Cabinet Highways Committee, when Mr Eggington would be able to make further representations to the Council.

(d) Public Question relating to Community Assemblies

Mr Nigel Slack read out the following statement:-

“The Council’s budget plans for 2013/14 include the disbanding of the seven Community Assemblies (CAs), in order to save some £2M. Whilst I understand the need for savings in face of the savage cuts being imposed by the short sighted Con/Dem Government, I also believe that this destruction of community autonomy and democracy should be opposed on principle and on practicality.

During a recent ‘Meet the Cabinet’ event at the latest Central Community Assembly, it was stated by one of the Cabinet that CA’s were a failure. This is clearly not the case for the Central CA, a fact attested to by every councillor on it and according to it’s, for want of a better phrase, ‘Annual Spending Report’. In that report it showed that the CA had:-

- Supported 12 area events.
- Given grants to 36 local organisations, from faith groups to gay pride and from urban gardens to sports clubs.
- Supported the General Cemetery, a green space near the city centre accessed by many across the CA boundaries.
- Supported the employment of seven people, a worthy act in itself, but also one that benefits the communities for whom they work.
- Supported Youth activity across the year particularly over the dark nights period of Halloween and Bonfire Night.
- Supported activities and groups for the elderly
- Supported Tara’s and Community Forums across the area.
- Funded additional street cleaning and collections where Veolia seem unable to do so.

As Councillor Curran (Chair of the Central CA) commented, that is not a record of failure. These actions support all of the five key ambitions of the Council’s Sheffield City Strategy 2010-2020 and, though we didn’t know it at the time are in line with

several of the guidelines of the Sheffield Fairness Framework namely; those in greatest need should take priority, preventing inequalities is better than trying to cure them, to be seen to act in a fair way as well as acting fairly and fairness must be a matter of balance between different groups, communities and generations in the City.

At the same Meet the Cabinet' event in a written answer to a similar question, the Cabinet stated. "...we are seeking to support the establishment of arrangements whereby Ward Members, service providers, local people, the VCF sector ...etc....can come together to address issues of common concern and be open to local challenge and scrutiny..."

Doesn't that sound like a CA to you? It does to me, because that is very unlikely to happen at ward level. Would senior management from outsourcing companies attend countless meetings across the City? Would the Police and Crime Commissioner? Would members of the Cabinet?

Even in the Council's own proposals it states. "Stop funding Community Assembly and Locality Management teams at a combined cost of £995,000. Use £280,000 of the remaining fund to provide our officers to support groupings of wards and area based structures." CA's by another name?

By comparison to the current system the proposals for a ward based system risks divisiveness and unrest between wards. The opportunity for accusations of bias in favour of wards wholly occupied by ruling administration councillors or wholly represented by Cabinet members would be rife. Unfounded or not, this would be detrimental to the surrounding communities and potentially damaging to the Fairness Framework and the democratic processes in the City.

Can I therefore ask the Council to take note that in a straw poll at the end of the last Central CA, over half those in attendance said they would continue to attend even if the CA had no spending facility?

Will the Council amend the proposals to allow for the possibility that CA's may survive, even if their funding is drastically reduced, rather than this apparently final decision that throws the baby out with the bathwater, and that they will undertake a fair consultation process more effective and extensive than the few days allowed so far?"

Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) responded that he welcomed Mr Slack's recognition of the Council's budget difficulties and that he would be moving an amendment to a Motion submitted to today's Council meeting concerning the future of Community Assemblies which the Council would debate if possible. He added that Councillor David Baker, who had been one of the architects of the current Community Assembly system, had also indicated that Community Assemblies had not operated as they should have and had a number of flaws.

Councillor Iqbal added that he disagreed with Mr Slack's comments about Ward-level work being divisive and that Mr Slack was pre-empting proposals that were still

being developed, although he acknowledged that Councillors would have to do more at a local level as resources were limited. He added that many good ideas had been obtained from the Council's consultation exercise and the Council was working with the voluntary, community and faith sectors and service providers on the future including the possibility of co-locating services along Community Assembly boundaries. However, he suggested that it was not appropriate to continue to invest in a model that was not engaging with the public as the Council would like and where there were many other competing priorities for Council funding. However, he would take account of Mr Slack's comments and respond to him following the conclusion of the second round of consultation.

As regards the Fairness Commission, Councillor Iqbal indicated that the Council would respond, like any other public sector to the Commission's recommendations, which would be taken forward in the near future.

(e) Public Question relating to Multi-Agency Support Teams (MASTs)

Nigel Slack referred to the last full Council meeting when a question was asked about the funding of MASTs. The reply indicated that MASTs were multi agency and funded across those agencies. As a result no figures were given. He asked:-

What was the Council's contribution to the MAST budget for 2012/13 and what will it be for 2013/14?

If you are unable to answer this, can you tell me how you can ensure value for money from the Council's contribution and where this leaves transparency in these contributions?

Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) responded that the total budget for MASTs for 2012/13 was £7.1 million of which the schools contribution was £3 million and the Council's £4.1 million. The 2013/14 budget will be considered by the Cabinet on 13th February, 2013 and full Council on 1st March, 2013 and, if approved, would mean a £1.3% efficiency reduction in the MAST budget (to cover information technology costs and national pay rise) totalling £94, 000 and an additional £69,000 to cover the cost of lost time due to sickness. The final budget figure for 2013/14 will require formal approval but is estimated at this time to be £6.936 million. She added that the Council would try to protect as far as it could breast feeding services and early intervention support for vulnerable families.

(f) Public Questions relating to Highfield Adventure Playground

(i) Berie Stott stated that the Highfield Adventure Playground was used by children between the ages of 8–16 in one of the most diverse communities in Sheffield. This view had been supported by a Police Inspector who welcomed the Playground as a safe, welcoming and inclusive play facility and had suggested that, the Playground helped a situation where many of the young people at risk of involvement in anti-social behaviour and criminality were able to use the Playground. The supervision of the Playground by trained staff helped in identifying those young people who's behaviour could be putting them at a higher risk of offending in the future.

She therefore asked how the Council could justify the cuts to such a vital community resource in light of the social problems and expense losing them will create?

(ii) Jo Taylor referred to recommendations produced by Sheffield's Fairness Commission framework which sought to promote fairness by, amongst other things, focussing on issues which communities could do for themselves. She therefore asked how was closing the Highfield Adventure Playground promoting these recommendations.

(iii) Maughan Pearce suggested that the Adventure Playground was an easy way for Activity Sheffield to make required cuts to their budget, but that the extent of the cuts were unfair that the local community were facing as outlined in the budget proposals. She asked, given that the Playground had been built up over 40 years and had such strong community support, did the Council feel that it was fair that the funding of the Playground was withdrawn in the way proposed, which would mean the end of the service it provided to the community over many years?

(iv) Kate West, referred to the petition opposing cuts in expenditure on the Adventure Playground which had now reached 2,500 signatures. She stated that the Playground had 25, 000 visits per year by children and parents from one of Sheffield's most diverse communities and that a recent Fun Day had attracted 300 people. She suggested that the Council's public consultation on the future of the Playground had been inadequate and asked whether the Council felt that the consultation was a reasonable effort?

Councillor Isobel Bowler (Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure) responded that she had personally met with the Friends of the Adventure Playground on more than three occasions and that the Council's officers had also met with users to discuss ways that services could continue at the Playgrounds. The Council had to consider all options to balance its budget whilst at the same time considering the needs of vulnerable young people. However, in the financial circumstances the Council found itself in, a number of leisure facilities were coming under pressure. The Council were currently examining options including working with community groups and professional agencies to deliver services but in a different way. Unfortunately, however, the Council could not continue to deliver services the way they had been in the past.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal stated that the Leader had instigated the Fairness Commission last year which operated on a non-partisan basis and whose with representation included representatives from all political parties. The Commission's report was only recently published and organisations would have an opportunity to respond to its recommendations.

- (g) Public Questions on Audio and Video Recording of Council meetings, the Fairness Commission, the Future of Council Housing, Area representation, Public Consultation and Council Tax Summonses.

Martin Brighton asked the following questions:-

- (i) As reported on 6 December 2010, Labour controlled Southwark Council agreed

to allow audio and video recording of its meetings. Why can't this Council follow Labour's Southwark's example?

(ii) Page 68 of the Fairness Commission Report, which has just been issued, lists participant Lee Adams as Deputy Chief Executive of Sheffield City Council. Why?

(iii) Future of Council Housing: There are currently 8 sub-set consultation groups, each distinct by subject. Will this Council please ensure that the minutes of each of these meetings are published online?

(iv) What criteria does this Council recognise for individuals to claim that they represent an area, or a community, or a Council service user group, and or for the same individual to claim to speak on behalf of an area, community or Council user group?

(v) In the news recently it has been reported that this Council is being challenged via litigation as to the legitimacy of its consultation processes with respect to decisions made that affect citizens. The Council has heard from this citizen for years how consultation processes are a sham, the creation and maintenance of an illusion falsely claiming meaningful engagement of citizens in the decision-making processes that affect their lives and their communities, whilst all the while imposing by stealth, secrecy or fait-accompli the original agenda.

What are the possibilities of this Council having genuine consultation with its citizens?

(vi) In The Star there is a report about a fiasco involving Capita and the issue of 5000 summonses on the same day, many if not all of which were invalid. The Cabinet Member for Finance is reported as saying that he wanted a report by yesterday, Tuesday. Will that report now be published and who creates, distributes and manages the rates summonses process?

Councillor Julie Dore (Leader) responded that, with regard to the audio and visual recording, the Council had heard today of the difficult financial circumstances that the Council finds itself in and, therefore, spending £100,000 for example on audio and video recording would be nowhere near any of the Council's financial priorities due to its cost. However, the Council has looked at the use of such equipment at Southwark and the take up rate was low.

In terms of consultation, Councillor Dore stated that Irwin Mitchell were holding the Council to account about alleged penalties implemented with respect to the Bedroom Tax and Council Tax Benefit in that they were not implemented legitimately. However, she was unable to comment any further on this as the Council was involved in a litigation process. The Chief Executive commented that there were a number of issues in relation to the Council Tax benefit changes as it was a live case and that the Council would defend its case robustly.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) indicated

that the Council's former Deputy Chief Executive, Lee Adams, had participated in the Fairness Commission, However, she had now left the Authority but continued to be involved in the Commission's work in a voluntary capacity. In terms of the question about the criteria used by the Council for accreditation of community representatives, there were no such criteria. A number of people had attended the Council meeting today to present petitions or ask a public question, sometimes representing Friends groups for example, where members of the community came together due to their particular interest in a matter. Indeed, there a wide range of groups who the Council consulted with, such as the centre for Independent Living or the Access Liaison Group, but Councillor Iqbal re-iterated that there were no set criteria for community representative accreditation.

Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) stated that it seemed sensible to publish the minutes of Future of Housing project Groups online. However, as the Groups had been established between the Council and Sheffield homes at the behest of tenants, he would have to consult with tenants and Sheffield Homes on the matter. He would raise the issue at the next meeting of the Future of Council Housing Project Group and, if possible, would ensure that the minutes are published.

With respect to the issue of Council Tax summonses, Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources) responded that he had asked for a report from Capita requesting that they explain what had happened as the situation that had occurred had been resulted in the totally unacceptable of the people of Sheffield. Councillor Lodge stated that there had been a serious problem with the delivery of the Council summons to individual addresses and this was being investigated. In order to provide a full explanation of the full circumstances of the case, Councillor Lodger read out the following statement:-

"There has been a serious problem with a 2 week delay in postage of court summons sent by our contractor Capita. This meant people did not receive their summons to the Court session last Friday in good time. On Monday I met with Capita's site director and received a full apology from him for the inconvenience and stress caused to people by this. I would like to add my own apologies and I can confirm that I am following up the causes. Capita are still investigating why the Royal Mail did not deliver on time and will report back as soon as possible. When the cause is found any compensation payable will be donated by Capita to a local charity.

What I can confirm, is that at the time the summons list was prepared, most of the people on the list did have outstanding council tax arrears and were correctly summonsed. A number of people have since paid. We do have evidence though that a small number of people were incorrectly summonsed. I'm investigating why this happened and I would encourage anyone else who thinks they are in this position to get in touch with Capita or me directly.

Where people were incorrectly summonsed, the £48 costs that are normally charged will be waived by Capita. Where people were summonsed correctly and still owe arrears, but were inconvenienced, we have extended the deadline for when they can pay their council tax to 22nd February, so that the 2 week delay is

compensated for. Everyone who pays by then will not be charged the normal £30 liability order. The cost of waiving these fees will be met by Capita in order to compensate people and the Council for the problem Capita have caused.

I must add that I am disappointed in the Liberal Democrats playing politics with this. There was a serious problem in Capita's process, but they have apologised and people will be compensated where they were incorrectly summonsed. The Liberal Democrats state that "hundreds" of people were incorrectly summonsed – I don't believe they have evidence of this, but if they do I would appreciate them forwarding it me and we can deal with their cases, instead of the Liberals playing political games with people's welfare. "

Councillor Lodge added that if anyone felt they had been unfairly summonsed then should either get in touch with Capita or himself.

(h) Public Questions on proposed Closure of the Stocksbridge Leisure Centre

(i) Suzy Senior asked the following questions :-

(A if the Stocksbridge Leisure Centre closed in April what was the City Council intending to do with the land and buildings?

(B) if the Leisure Centre were to close, where would the children of Stocksbridge have swimming lessons and how would the City Council ensure that local schools comply with the legal requirements for swimming lessons and what arrangements would the Council put in place to help them to do so?

(C) in terms of the Olympic Legacy money allocated to Sheffield, was it possible that some of that funding be used for upgrading and renovating the Stocksbridge Leisure Centre?

(D) would the City Council work with local people with a view to the facility being run by local people financially and independently of the City Council?

(ii) Reginald Swift referred to the use of the Leisure centre by the Stocksbridge Bowling Club for six months during the winter and asked had any consideration been given to an alternative facility that the club could use together with approximately 250 independent bowlers that used the Centre each week. He commented that there was no comparative purpose-built facility in Sheffield and, as the majority of bowlers were retired, this facility promoted their physical and mental welfare.

(iii) Nigel Owen, Stocksbridge Town Councillor, asked in light of the statement made today by Rebecca Adlington that not enough children can swim 25 metres by the age of 11, what are the Council going to do to make provision for children attending school in Stocksbridge to be able to attend swimming lessons if the Stocksbridge Leisure Centre closes and furthermore, ensure that schools fulfil their duty in this respect? In asking his question, Mr Scott stated that Stocksbridge was surrounded by dams, with the River Don also close by and he feared that in this sort of environment and the difficulties some children might experience in accessing

swimming lessons should the Leisure Centre close, there could be an increase in fatalities in the absence of controlled facilities for swimming. He therefore asked the Council to reconsider its proposals and keep the Leisure centre open.

(iv) Jack Clarkson suggested that the Council should support the work being undertaken by the local community at Stocksbridge to keep the Centre open and asked if this would happen.

Councillor Isobel Bowler (Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure) responded that the land and buildings were in the ownership of the Oxley Park Trust and that the Council was a Trustee. Discussions were being held into the possibility that the Trusteeship could be passed to the Stocksbridge Town Council but the terms of the Trust stated that the land should be kept for the benefit of the people of Stocksbridge and, therefore, any transfer of land and property owned by the Trust had to be in keeping with the Trust's terms. Councillor Bowler stated that the Council, Trust and Town Council would continue to work together with the community to look for a solution.

As far as capital funding was concerned, the £10 million Olympic Legacy, would help to fund a National Centre for Sports and Exercise Medicine which would have, as its main hub, the Graves Centre. The capital funding was allocated by the Government and was attached to a specific range of responsibilities to improve health which was led by the National Health Service. Therefore, there was little, if any, scope for allocating funding to Stocksbridge from this source of funding as its purpose was specific and prescriptive. The national curriculum responsibility for ensuring that children could swim rested with schools. Should the Stocksbridge Pool cease to be available, the Council would work with local schools to book time to ensure that children had access to swimming lessons at other venues.

She stated that, with respect bowls, she acknowledged that Stocksbridge had a dedicated indoor bowling facility and accepted that there was no comparable indoor bowling provision. Council officers were working with bowlers to discuss their requirements in the winter months either at a Leisure Centre or some other facility.

(i) Public questions on Advice Centres, Newton Grange Residential Home, Socksbridge and the refurbishment of the Town Hall

Jack Clarkson asked whether it was the view of the Council that the people of Stocksbridge were being socially excluded as shown by the closure of the Stocksbridge Advice Centre, the closure of the Deepcar dumpsite and the closure of the Newton Grange Residential Home?

Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) suggested that some local Councillors had been engaged in scaremongering about the Council's proposals and as Cabinet Member with responsibility for grant funding, he had had the responsibility, on behalf of the Council, to carry out a City-wide review of Advice services. The Council was attempting to streamline such services as far as it could but he had given assurances to the Manager of the Stocksbridge Advice Centre, that the Council would continue to provide Advice services in Stocksbridge.

Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living) responded that, in the case of the closure of the Newton Grange Home, this had been closed in accordance with best practice, with residents being offered care in Penistone, Sheffield or other parts of the country as they required. Fifty new homes would be built on the site and Sweeney House were delighted with the new development and the opportunity to move into purpose-built older peoples accommodation as were other Stocksbridge residents. She added that there would be wide consultation with the local community on the proposed new development which would greatly benefit older people when built.

Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources) also responded that there was a large degree of misinformation regarding the cost of repairs required to the Town Hall and that Mr. Clarkson had, when a City Councillor last year, supported £2 million of repairs. He added that the Town Hall was a Grade 1 listed building and essential repairs were required to the building as repairs had been deferred in previous years. Councillor Lodge added that many of the costs assigned by people to the refurbishment of the Town Hall's meeting rooms were inaccurate and that £170,000 had been set aside to upgrade office accommodation in the Town Hall. In general terms, if the repairs had not been carried out at this time, then the cost of such repairs would have cost an estimated £3 million.

(j) Public Questions on Early Years' Service

A number of questions were asked in relation to the Early Years' Service as follows:-

(i) Paula Jones commented that the questions asked within the Early Years consultation were unclear, that there were still a lot of people that did not know what children's centres offered and that the Council should stop wasting money on such consultations and start to listen more closely to local communities, who should be permitted to manage the buildings and activities involved in delivering the Early Years' Service. She therefore asked why the Council had asked questions that people did not fully understand the implications of and why the Council had failed to encourage people to use the centres?

(ii) Linda Edwards commented that, in order to justify the removal of financial support to nurseries, the Council has had to exclude childcare from Sheffield's vision for early identification and intervention services for young people. She stated that parents and workers had been informed that funding was available to support the delivery of quality childcare to support families and children in deprived areas of Sheffield, through the Big Lottery Fund for specific purposes in relation to children aged 0-3 years. A one-off bid for funding could be submitted by the Council in partnership with the community which had resulted in a meeting with invited parties to discuss the issue. However, no childcare providers were included in this invitation.

Ms. Edwards therefore asked why and how could groups with detailed knowledge of regeneration or adult health know better than childcare providers how to support child development, speech and language and social and emotional development.

(iii) Chrissy Meleady referred to the statements made by the Council that the sole cause of loss of funding from Early Years was the removal of Early Intervention Grant and to the funding for childcare funding available this year for childcare. She asked where the current funding for childcare had gone and whether the Council would recognise the reality of the current situation and acknowledge that the Council were taking decisions to reduce Early Years' funding notwithstanding Government policy and simply not blame the coalition Government for the current position?

(iv) Tracey Greene asked whether the final Cabinet decision had already been made notwithstanding the current consultation? She also asked had the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families originally intended to consult with every Children's Centre and interview every parent in order to encourage them to complete which, she alleged, was a misleading survey and, if so, how much did this exercise cost?

(v) Peter Davies stated that the GMB was one of the recognised trade unions with whom the Council consulted and negotiated with and that the GMB represented approximately one third of those employees who looked like losing their jobs as a result of the proposed cuts to Children's Centres. He therefore asked why the Council had not responded to the report submitted by the GMB submitted to the last meeting of the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee requesting an extension to the consultation process?

(vi) Professor Pat Broadhead referred to the potential additional support that would be needed for children and families if children's centres closed as the private sector would not absorb the resulting extra demand arising from the closures. She added that the centres/nurseries provided support in developing young children and assisted mothers back into employment and were fundamental to a child's well being and chances in its future life. Professor Broadhead commented that, historically, the voluntary sector had been vital in supporting the viability of the City's childcare structure and that if the Council's proposals, as they stood, were implemented then this would place the centres/nurseries wider infra-structure in jeopardy.

Professor Broadhead asked therefore was the City Council intent on ignoring its own strong traditions and legacy of supported childcare for children and families in disadvantaged communities at a time when those communities were in greatest need and which would adversely affect the City in general?

(vii) Emma Chadwick referred to a number of questions which had been submitted to her by people who were not able to attend the meeting and Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) responded that if she was supplied with their contact details she would respond to the questions submitted.

Ms. Chadwick asked why the Council had not submitted, in partnership with childcare providers, an application to the Big Lottery Fund to help support childcare in the City. She commented that the money made available under the scheme

would provide an ideal opportunity to help the current situation and assist local communities to support services and avoid putting children's futures at risk. Ms Chadwick also asked whether the Council would allow people who had not been trained to the required standard to look after children? She stated that this was a big concern for parents of children with learning difficulties such as Autism and that parents wanted to ensure that their children were cared for in a safe, relaxed environment where their happiness flourished.

(viii) Megan Beardsmore asked that, with respect to the Council's consultation, why did those Council staff, when visiting children's centres, not write down the comments that were made by parents and providers but indicate that they should put their comments on line?

She also asked how the Council's agency was going to ensure high quality, affordable childcare, particularly to ensure that there was no overcharging, the maintenance of flexibility of provision as well as high quality standards?

Finally, Ms. Beardsmore asked would Early Years Services be put out for tender for competition with voluntary groups and would they be inspected by Ofsted so that they could assess whether the services they provided were good, average or poor? She commented that there was a need to award contracts only to those providers who were delivering outstanding childcare already.

Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) responded to the above questions and stated that the Council wanted to ensure that all families across the City wherever they had access to a range of services including childcare, health services, midwifery and breast feeding support within walking distance by a range of organisations. She stated that within the Council's proposals, the definition of "Area" reflected this aim of ensuring access to a range of services was close to where families lived and would not require parents and children to travel large distances to access these services.

Councillor Drayton added that the suggestions that the consultation process was not clear or open was misleading as she had attended many meetings to discuss the Council's proposals which had supplemented the formal consultation. She had requested officers to go out into communities and speak with parents and carers about the proposals as she felt the on-line consultation facility was insufficient as a means of securing all views. However, she stated that the recently held consultation was only a small part of the overall consultation on Early Years' Services which had been on-going over the past 18 months.

In terms of the report produced by the GMB for submission to the Children, Young People and family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, Councillor Drayton responded that she had not been aware that the report had been submitted to the Scrutiny Committee for consideration and certainly did not receive a copy herself before the meeting. She would, however, seek to ensure that answers to the questions raised by the GMB in the report would be sent to them as soon as possible. She further reiterated she was aware that the Unions had a duty to represent their members and had at all times tried to keep them up to date with developments and, to that end, she had a meeting with the Trade Unions prior to

the Cabinet meeting at which Unite, Unison, NASUWT and the NUT were present but unfortunately there must have been a misunderstanding as no representative from the GMB attended.

With regard to a Lottery bid, Councillor Drayton stated that local authorities had been asked to submit Expressions of Interest for funding involving a 10 year bidding regime for services for 0-3 year olds. She had heard about the funding from Ms. Meleady. However, the Council had received information very late with a short timescale to get back an Expression of Interest. She added that any funding received would have to be delivered through voluntary/charity organisations, not the Council and it was vital that the bid was developed in partnership. Councillor Drayton stated she was aware that a meeting was being held and she was keen to ensure that all providers had the opportunity to attend so had asked officers to ensure everyone received an invite to it.

Councillor Drayton, in responding to questions raised on funding, stated that when, in 2009/10, the current Administration was in opposition and considering the then Administration's proposals to cut subsidy grant, the Labour Opposition had indicated that it would work with providers, parents and carers to create proposals that took account of the current financial situation but, however, the Council now had little room for manoeuvre due to the Government's policy of removing the ring fence from the Sure Start budget and the cuts were now deep and too soon.

Early Intervention Grant was now ring-fenced to youth activities and the Aiming High fund for families with disabilities. In future, the only Government funding would be for the Free Early Learning Programme with no available funding remaining for Early Intervention Services. However, the Council had attempted to protect Early Intervention and Protection Services through wrap around services for children and families and would continue to work with providers, carers and families to ensure that the money available was targeted on the services for children and families and do whatever possible to protect services to children and families.

Petitions Requiring Debate

Petition regarding proposed funding reductions in the Early Years Service

4.3

To debate a petition containing approximately 10,000 signatures objecting to proposed funding reductions in the Early Years Service. The wording of the petition is as follows:-

(a)

"We the undersigned recognise that Sheffield's Community Nurseries and Children's Centres provide universal, culturally sensitive, high quality education and care as well as preventative services for ALL families. They support parents on low incomes to gain access to employment. They support parents to access further education or gain basic skills. More importantly they give children from deprived backgrounds the important early year's experience that gives them the right start in life.

In 2011-12 seven nurseries in Sheffield got an "Outstanding" grade from Ofsted, five of these will be placed at risk if these proposals go forward, making a mockery of

the “Narrowing the Gap” and “Raising attainment” agenda as they are all in areas of deprivation. We believe that the Council has not fully understood the impact of these cuts. We the undersigned confirm our opposition to the Early Years Redesign and our opposition to Sheffield City Council’s decision to withdraw funding from community nurseries and remove the early education and care from Children’s Centres which will have a devastating effect in the deprived communities at a time when they need it most. We call on the Council to take immediate action and call on them to:

- *shelve these proposals*
- *consult with communities about the models of support they require*
- *look at alternative areas to reduce costs.*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Emma Chadwick and Sally Pearce. They stated that the Council should work with the providers of childcare. Whilst it was recognised that the Council was in a difficult financial position due to Government cuts, Sheffield did have choices and it was important to collectively develop a strong vision for early years. Early years provision also supported women and families in relation to language, health and employment and made a positive contribution to community cohesion. The not for profit childcare providers also pulled in significant additional funding. Quality early years provision also had an important role in narrowing the gap for children in deprived areas and raising attainment much later in the child’s education.

At the Tinsley Green Centre, for example, the withdrawal of workers from the area would affect the sustainability services as a whole. The timescales for redesign of services were particularly tight and transformation funding was needed whilst the commissioning of services was taking place. People had to have faith that the process was still at the stage of consultation and that the Council would listen to people and ensure that an equitable approach was adopted. They proposed an honest round table discussion when the results of consultation are known.

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

- It was recognised that the early years were of great importance to a child’s development and their life chances.
- The childcare providers in the City were respected for their experience, and provided high quality services. The Council needed to find a way of continuing to provide support for childcare provision
- The funding provided to the Council was being directed to early learning and away from early intervention and prevention.
- The Council must listen carefully to the views of parents and providers of early years services as part of the consultation and in questions which were submitted at meetings at which the issue was discussed, such as Council.
- The Children Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy

Development Committee had requested Cabinet to consider what transitional arrangements were needed to ensure that good quality early years provision was sustained; further detail of provision within the 17 areas; and a communications plan to inform parents. The Committee would reconvene prior to the Cabinet meeting at which the redesign of early years services would be considered on 27 February 2013.

- The provision of quality childcare was an important factor in women with children finding employment.

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

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:

- Endorses the recommendations of the Scrutiny Board
- Further notes the representations made today and recognise the need for transitional arrangements to consider all support needed, including direct funding, to ensure the continuity of Early Years provision and that all partners involved in Early Years provision be included.
- Refers the petition, with these recommendations, to Cabinet.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:

(a) thanks local people for bringing the petition and shares the strength of feeling about the importance of early years services;

(b) agrees that all concerns that have been raised throughout this process and at this Council meeting about the early years proposals will feed into the consultation which will inform the Cabinet report and recommendations later this month; and

(c) directs that the recommendations should be considered by the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee meeting on the morning of 27th February 2013 and also directs that the Rt. Hon. Michael Gove, MP (Secretary of State for Education), Elizabeth Truss, MP (Under-Secretary of State for Education and Childcare) and the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg, MP (Deputy Prime Minister) be invited to attend the Scrutiny Committee and/or Cabinet meetings.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried, as follows:

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) thanks local people for bringing the petition and shares the strength of feeling about the importance of early years services;
- (b) agrees that all concerns that have been raised throughout this process and at this Council meeting about the early years proposals will feed into the consultation which will inform the Cabinet report and recommendations later this month; and
- (c) directs that the recommendations should be considered by the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee meeting on the morning of 27th February 2013 and also directs that the Rt. Hon. Michael Gove, MP (Secretary of State for Education), Elizabeth Truss, MP (Under-Secretary of State for Education and Childcare) and the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg, MP (Deputy Prime Minister) be invited to attend the Scrutiny Committee and/or Cabinet meetings.

Petition regarding the proposed closure of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre

To debate a petition containing approximately 7,500 signatures expressing concern over the proposals to close Stocksbridge Leisure Centre. The wording of the petition is as follows:-

(b)

“We the undersigned are very concerned citizens of Stocksbridge, Deepcar and surrounding areas over the proposals to close Stocksbridge Leisure Centre. We urge Sheffield City Council to seriously consider an alternative to closure of this important and much needed community facility.”

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Emma Gregory, who stated that she was speaking on behalf of Mary Kay, who had started the petition. She questioned the fairness of the decision to close the Leisure Centre, which was based on footfall and did not consider the catchment area of people using the facilities. She asserted that Stocksbridge Leisure Centre was well utilised when compared to other facilities such as Hillsborough or Concord. There was great community support for the campaign to retain the Leisure Centre.

She asked the Council to consider the effect that closure of Leisure would have, for example on public swimming and swimming lessons. Every week, more than 500 children had swimming lessons and paraolympians used the pool to train. The Leisure Centre also facilitated gymnastics, indoor bowls, GP referrals, senior sessions, junior football, martial arts, fitness classes, trampoline and racket sports. The facilities were also used by local schools. Stocksbridge was 10 miles away from Sheffield and there was not transport available to travel to alternative Leisure facilities.

Emma Gregory read a poem concerning Alice, a child of six who was inspired by the Olympics and who was learning to swim at the Leisure Centre. She stated that there had been little time to look at alternatives and opportunity to put together a sustainable facility which meets the needs of the community. She proposed that twelve months would be needed for this to happen, and the Council's continued

support was required.

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

Members were appreciative and impressed at the way people in Stocksbridge and Deepcar had come together to look for solutions to the matter, showing their knowledge, passion and commitment. There was joint work being undertaken with the Stocksbridge Town Council to explore options for a sustainable future for the Leisure Centre and Sport England had commissioned a study regarding the feasibility of keeping the facilities open. Funding had been identified to keep the Leisure Centre open for an additional month. However, it was also argued that a longer period might be needed to create a viable plan for a sustainable facility.

There was apprehension about the effect of a closure of the Leisure Centre on local schools' duty to provide swimming lessons. Stocksbridge was an isolated community and there was concern about the withdrawal of the sports and leisure facilities, which the Leisure Centre provided, on public health. Stocksbridge Leisure Centre was a long standing and well loved facility. In terms of visitor numbers per head of population, the Leisure Centre represented one of the highest. The Leisure Centre did require a higher than average level of subsidy although might also be due to its location.

With regard to investment in other City leisure centres, Sheffield International Venues had identified a need for health and safety works to be carried out at Graves Leisure Centre.

In her right of reply, Emma Gregory referred to the increase in footfall at the Leisure Centre in the previous 12 months and stated that the venue with the highest subsidy in Sheffield was Ponds Forge. It was difficult for people in Stocksbridge to access other facilities and there was going to be an increase in housing in the area and she asked what facilities would be there for people. She asked for more time to complete a business plan whereby the community might look after the Leisure Centre themselves.

The City Council then considered courses of action available in response to the petition. The following two proposals were moved in response to the petition received relating to Stocksbridge Leisure Centre and the subsequent debate.

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council:-

- Thanks the petitioners and congratulates them on a strong campaign
- Resolves to refer the matter to cabinet with the recommendation that they extend funding to Stocksbridge Leisure Centre to give sufficient time for a business plan to be developed by the community and interested parties, as requested in the petition

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

It was then moved by Councillor Isobel Bowler, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:-

- (a) thanks local people for bringing the petition and recognises the strength of feeling about the impact that the closure of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre would have on the local community;
- (b) confirms that the Council is looking for a long term sustainable leisure strategy for the whole city in an environment of diminishing revenue support;
- (c) welcomes Sheffield City Council and Sport England's commissioning of an independent study to help identify the feasibility of keeping the Leisure Centre open and any other options which might be able to deliver a sustainable leisure offer in Stocksbridge;
- (d) welcomes the partnership working between the Council and Stocksbridge Town Council to look at options for the future provision of leisure services for Stocksbridge; and
- (e) however, regrettably accepts that due to the level of cuts that the Government is making to the Council, the proposal to remove the £400,000 subsidy can not be removed from the Council's budget proposals.

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried, as follows:
RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) thanks local people for bringing the petition and recognises the strength of feeling about the impact that the closure of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre would have on the local community;
- (b) confirms that the Council is looking for a long term sustainable leisure strategy for the whole city in an environment of diminishing revenue support;
- (c) welcomes Sheffield City Council and Sport England's commissioning of an independent study to help identify the feasibility of keeping the Leisure Centre open and any other options which might be able to deliver a sustainable leisure offer in Stocksbridge;
- (d) welcomes the partnership working between the Council and Stocksbridge Town Council to look at options for the future provision of leisure services for Stocksbridge; and
- (e) however, regrettably accepts that due to the level of cuts that the Government is making to the Council, the proposal to remove the £400,000 subsidy can not be removed from the Council's budget proposals.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 5.5 relating to the time limit for meetings of the Council, Item No. 5 on the Summons, relating to Members' Questions, was not considered.

(At 6.45pm, the Lord Mayor vacated the Chair and left the meeting and the Deputy Lord Mayor took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.)

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

(a) (i) notes that the Director of Modern Governance, in consultation with the Chief Executive, has undertaken a review of the composition of the Authority's Independent Remuneration Panel (established under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003) and conducted a targeted recruitment exercise which sought to secure sector representation and diversity in appointments and;

(ii) endorses the under-mentioned appointments to the Panel, to serve up to a maximum of four years:-

- Mr David Baldwin, retired Health Service Executive (public sector)
- Mr Mark Power, Head of Internal Audit, SIG plc (private sector)
- Ms. Abtisam Mohammed, Programme Director, Yemeni Community Association (VCF Sector)
- Ms. Lynda Hinxman, Sheffield Hallam University (academic sector);

(b) (i) approves the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Panels, Groups, etc:

Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group:
Councillor Ibrar Hussain to replace Councillor Steve Wilson

School Admissions Forum:
Councillors Ian Saunders and Ibrar Hussain to fill vacancies; and

(ii) appoints representatives to serve on other bodies as follows:-

Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust:
Vivian Kenneth Lockwood to replace Stuart Bennett (non-Council representative)

Yorkshire and the Humber Tobacco Governance Board:
Councillor Clive Skelton to fill a vacancy

7. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

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

- (a) adopts the changes to the following Parts of the Constitution, as set out in the report and appendices:-
- (i) Part 2 - Articles 4, 7, 9, 11,12 and 16
 - (ii) Part 3 - Responsibility for Functions
 - (iii) Part 4 - Council Procedure Rules and Miscellaneous Matters
 - (iv) Part 4 - Contracts Standing Orders
 - (v) Part 4 - Access to Information Rules
 - (vi) Part 4 - Executive Procedure Rules
 - (vii) Part 5 - Officers' Code of Conduct
 - (viii) Part 5 - Protocol for Member/Officer Relations
 - (ix) Part 7 - Management Structure and Proper Officers; and
- (b) notes that the changes relating to creating the statutory post of Director of Public Health and setting up a statutory Health and Well Being Board will take effect from 1 April 2013.

8. CHANGES TO COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS FOR SECOND HOMES AND EMPTY PROPERTIES

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council approves the proposals relating to Council Tax discounts and the Empty Homes Premium detailed in this report and set out in Appendix 1 to come into force on 1st April 2013.

9. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN 2012-17 UPDATE AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET AND RENT INCREASE 2013

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting on 16th January 2013, concerning the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan 2012-17 Update and Housing Revenue Account Budget and Rent Increase 2013-14 be confirmed.

“RESOLVED: That this Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 6th February, 2013 that :-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan update report for 2013/14 be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2013/14 as set out in Appendix B of the Cabinet report be approved;
- (c) an increase in rents for Council dwellings by an average of 4.8% from April 2013 be approved;

- (d) an increase in annual rents for garages and garage sites by an average of 4.8% from April 2013 be approved;
- (e) an increase in community heating charges by 5% in 2013/14 be approved;
- (f) the Director of Commissioning, Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, be granted delegated authority to increase the sheltered housing service charge in the event of the City Wide Care Alarms charge being increased in 2013/14;
- (g) charges for furnished accommodation, interim accommodation, and burglar alarms be not increased; and
- (h) the Director of Commissioning, Communities and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, be granted delegated authority to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current government guidelines.”

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting on 16th January, 2013, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan 2012-17 and Housing Revenue Account Budget and Rent Increase 2013/14, be approved with the following amendments:-

- (a) reduces the rise in heating charges from 5% to 1% in line with benefit increases, which will mean that a further £136k will be required from the community heating reserves;
- (b) notes that the reported 2012/13 surplus has increased to £7m and recommends the additional £300k, if achieved at the year-end, is allocated to repairing and replacing heating systems and boilers;
- (c) welcomes the decision not to implement the unfair practice of charging new tenants a higher rent than existing tenants, as recommended by the largest opposition group; and
- (d) regrets that the Administration refused to approach the private developer of the Park Hill project to request that they meet the associated costs of the project, currently funded by this Council.

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

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

RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan update report for 2013/14 be approved;

- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2013/14 as set out in Appendix B of the Cabinet report be approved;
- (c) an increase in rents for Council dwellings by an average of 4.8% from April 2013 be approved;
- (d) an increase in annual rents for garages and garage sites by an average of 4.8% from April 2013 be approved;
- (e) an increase in community heating charges by 5% in 2013/14 be approved;
- (f) the Director of Commissioning, Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, be granted delegated authority to increase the sheltered housing service charge in the event of the City Wide Care Alarms charge being increased in 2013/14;
- (g) charges for furnished accommodation, interim accommodation, and burglar alarms be not increased; and
- (h) the Director of Commissioning, Communities and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, be granted delegated authority to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current government guidelines.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Council Budget Position

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Harry Harpham, that this Council:-

- (a) reconfirms its anger and dismay at the Council's budget position which is now significantly worse than was previously estimated because the Government are making additional unfair cuts to Sheffield as a result of their failure to grow the economy and notes that, even without the additional cuts, the Council was already facing an unprecedented level of cuts, which will have a massive impact on Council services in Sheffield;
- (b) notes that the Council has a £50 million budget gap for 2013/14 and this is in addition to the £140 million that has been reduced from the Council's budget over the past two years, meaning that future cuts will unavoidably have a bigger impact on Council services that are valued by local people;
- (c) is appalled that despite the Council having to set its budget on 1st March, 2013, the Local Government Finance Settlement was not given until the week before Christmas and believes that this demonstrates a complete disregard for local government;

- (d) regrets that the Government provided inaccurate figures to the Council and the public on the Settlement which were used to create an inaccurate and grossly misleading representation of the reductions facing local authorities and believes that this demonstrates their incompetence;
- (e) continues to oppose the unfairness of the cuts which see councils with the highest levels of deprivation receiving the majority of the cuts whilst some of the wealthiest areas in the country receive almost no cuts at all;
- (f) notes recent research from Newcastle City Council which indicates that Sheffield will receive a cut of nearly £200 per person between 2010/11 and 2014/15, wealthy areas are receiving significantly less cuts with Guildford receiving a cut of just £24.14 per person, Wokingham £26.53 and Epsom and Ewell just £15.18;
- (g) believes that the Deputy Prime Minister continues to betray and fail the people of Sheffield and is shocked that the main opposition group continue to support the unfair cuts that the Government are making to Sheffield;
- (h) regrets that due to the Deputy Prime Minister's complete inability to offer any plausible defence for the decisions his Government is making to impose unprecedented cuts to Sheffield City Council at the same time as wealthier councils receive just a fraction of the cuts, the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group have resorted to spouting factually inaccurate untruths about Council spending;
- (i) instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the Main Opposition Group to explain recent inaccuracies and misrepresentations recently propagated by the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group;
- (j) expects that in the future these inaccuracies will not be included in any statement or material issued by the party of the Deputy Prime Minister and the main opposition group;
- (k) notes that unfortunately many other councils across the country are facing significant reductions in services and this is reflected in the letters written to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government by all Core City Leaders explaining the impact that the cuts will have on their cities;
- (l) further notes that in the past two years, the Council has made £140 million of budget reductions and as far as possible has done so limiting the impact on front line visible Council services, however, recognises that the Government have continued to cut to a level that will mean it is no longer possible to avoid significant reductions to front line services;
- (m) further notes that proposals to balance the 2013/14 budget are now subject to consultation and impact upon areas across the Council,

including sports and leisure, health and care, youth services, early years, and Community Assemblies, acknowledging that, with the exception of child protection, no area of the Council will be unaffected by the cuts;

- (n) further notes that the proposals are still subject to consultation and the budget will be approved at Full Council on 1st March, 2013; and
- (o) confirms the present Administration's determination to protect services as far as possible, focusing on the long term and recognises the Administration's focus on protecting services for the vulnerable.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefore:-

- (a) laments the previous Government's inability to handle public finances, increasing the national deficit year-on-year from 2001 onwards, reaching a total of £43bn prior to the economic crash;
- (b) notes that the previous Government built up a record national deficit, where £1 in every £4 the Government spent was borrowed, leaving the current Government to clean up the mess they had created;
- (c) reminds Members of the commitment of the previous Government to halve the deficit by 2014, by pledging £82bn worth of cuts;
- (d) deplores Her Majesty's Opposition, who despite making this pledge, have refused to provide any credible plans of how they would have cut the national deficit in Government;
- (e) however, notes the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and the Shadow Chancellor who have refused to commit to reinstate funding for local government if elected;
- (f) regrets that the Administration continue to hypocritically scare-monger about Council budgets, in a desperate attempt to deflect blame for their own decisions and incompetence;
- (g) notes that while Sheffield will see a 3.9% reduction in its adjusted Formula Grant (including Early Intervention Grant and other funds), Wokingham will see a reduction of 5.6%, while Epsom & Ewell and Guildford will see reductions of 9.4% and 7.8% respectively;
- (h) further confirms that Sheffield City Council will have a spending power of £2,273 per dwelling next year compared to £1,845 for Wokingham, £306 for Epsom & Ewell and £284 for Guildford;
- (i) furthermore, thanks the Government for the overwhelming investment in Sheffield including the commitment to a High Speed Rail Station, £1.2bn

for the Streets Ahead programme, £9.9m for a University Technical College, over £100m through the Regional Growth Fund and millions of pounds in Sheffield's trains, trams, buses and cycle routes;

- (j) believes it is a shame that the current Administration continue to use Sheffield as a pawn in a political game, instead of working constructively with the Government;
- (k) in particular, regrets that the current Administration have taken an axe to front-line services, while they continue to waste money on vanity schemes and pet projects;
- (l) confirms the following facts:
 - (i) the Council's Statement of Accounts, signed off by the Chair of the Audit Committee, reported "usable reserves" of £167m;
 - (ii) the Council's 2012/13 Capital Programme earmarked £2.2m for "Town Hall Meeting Rooms" in the 2013/14 financial year;
 - (iii) the Council spent £475,000 a year on full time trade union officials, in addition to 61 members of staff performing trade union duties on a part time basis;
 - (iv) from December 2011 to November 2012, the Council recorded £4.7m of "consultancy" fees in payment to supplier documents;
 - (v) the Administration approved £2.5m to be spent at Park Hill; and
 - (vi) that a Cabinet Advisor twice proposed a pilot investigating i-pads for councillors;
- (m) is not surprised, that having attempted to silence opposition voices in this Council Chamber, the Administration are now attempting to use the Council as a tool to silence opposition voices outside of the Council;
- (n) believes also, that it is ironic for the Administration to talk of "factually inaccurate untruths" given their "6-month budget" claim in 2011, which was in no way justified by the facts;
- (o) furthermore, notes the Fair Deal for Sheffield campaign, launched by the local Labour Party, contains false claims about NHS funding, which Labour councillors were forced to retract in this Chamber due to their inaccuracy;
- (p) is pleased to see that the Fair Deal for Sheffield was boycotted by all opposition parties on this Council, who truly recognised the ploy as nothing more than a party-political stunt;
- (q) sincerely hopes that not a single penny of taxpayers' money is wasted on this party-political stunt; and
- (r) believes that if the Administration were serious about standing up for Sheffield, they would stop their petty party political games, eliminate the excessive waste within the Council and ensure much needed funds were

directed towards front-line services.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (p) to (s) as follows:-

- (p) notes the proposed reduction of over £2m to the 2013/14 levy for the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority;
- (q) understands that any decision to reduce the levy is made by the Integrated Transport Authority which includes 5 elected members from Sheffield;
- (r) believes that at a time of economic hardship and rising fuel prices, public transport is vitally important to prevent social exclusion and allow access to opportunities for all members of our communities; and
- (s) calls on all Sheffield members of the Integrated Transport Authority to oppose any reduction to the levy for 2013/14 and invest any budget savings in improvements to South Yorkshire's public transport network.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Stuart Wattam, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (p) to (r) as follows:-

- (p) notes that whilst the present Administration have taken full responsibility for their budget proposals whilst dealing with an unprecedented level of Government cuts, regrets that the main opposition group have opposed numerous proposals without presenting the full details of their budget outlining the alternative cuts that they would make;
- (q) believes that the main opposition group have acted irresponsibly through presenting factually inaccurate untruths about Council spending in an attempt to suggest that the Government's cuts can be made without impacting upon local services and believes that this is an attempt to mislead local people; and
- (r) therefore calls on all opposition groups to present details of their budget to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 13th February, 2013, remembering that when they were the ruling group, the main opposition group stated "it would not be open or honest for any political group to present their proposed budget on the morning of Budget Council day".

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) reconfirms its anger and dismay at the Council's budget position which is now significantly worse than was previously estimated because the Government are making additional unfair cuts to Sheffield as a result of their failure to grow the economy and notes that, even without the additional cuts, the Council was already facing an unprecedented level of cuts, which will have a massive impact on Council services in Sheffield;
- (b) notes that the Council has a £50 million budget gap for 2013/14 and this is in addition to the £140 million that has been reduced from the Council's budget over the past two years, meaning that future cuts will unavoidably have a bigger impact on Council services that are valued by local people;
- (c) is appalled that despite the Council having to set its budget on 1st March, 2013, the Local Government Finance Settlement was not given until the week before Christmas and believes that this demonstrates a complete disregard for local government;
- (d) regrets that the Government provided inaccurate figures to the Council and the public on the Settlement which were used to create an inaccurate and grossly misleading representation of the reductions facing local authorities and believes that this demonstrates their incompetence;
- (e) continues to oppose the unfairness of the cuts which see councils with the highest levels of deprivation receiving the majority of the cuts whilst some of the wealthiest areas in the country receive almost no cuts at all;
- (f) notes recent research from Newcastle City Council which indicates that Sheffield will receive a cut of nearly £200 per person between 2010/11 and 2014/15, wealthy areas are receiving significantly less cuts with Guildford receiving a cut of just £24.14 per person, Wokingham £26.53 and Epsom and Ewell just £15.18;
- (g) believes that the Deputy Prime Minister continues to betray and fail the people of Sheffield and is shocked that the main opposition group continue to support the unfair cuts that the Government are making to Sheffield;
- (h) regrets that due to the Deputy Prime Minister's complete inability to offer any plausible defence for the decisions his Government is making to impose unprecedented cuts to Sheffield City Council at the same time as wealthier councils receive just a fraction of the cuts, the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group have resorted to spouting factually inaccurate untruths about Council spending;
- (i) instructs the Chief Executive to write to the Deputy Prime Minister and

- Leader of the Main Opposition Group to explain recent inaccuracies and misrepresentations recently propagated by the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group;
- (j) expects that in the future these inaccuracies will not be included in any statement or material issued by the party of the Deputy Prime Minister and the main opposition group;
 - (k) notes that unfortunately many other councils across the country are facing significant reductions in services and this is reflected in the letters written to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government by all Core City Leaders explaining the impact that the cuts will have on their cities;
 - (l) further notes that in the past two years, the Council has made £140 million of budget reductions and as far as possible has done so limiting the impact on front line visible Council services, however, recognises that the Government have continued to cut to a level that will mean it is no longer possible to avoid significant reductions to front line services;
 - (m) further notes that proposals to balance the 2013/14 budget are now subject to consultation and impact upon areas across the Council, including sports and leisure, health and care, youth services, early years, and Community Assemblies, acknowledging that, with the exception of child protection, no area of the Council will be unaffected by the cuts;
 - (n) further notes that the proposals are still subject to consultation and the budget will be approved at Full Council on 1st March, 2013;
 - (o) confirms the present Administration's determination to protect services as far as possible, focusing on the long term and recognises the Administration's focus on protecting services for the vulnerable;
 - (p) notes that whilst the present Administration have taken full responsibility for their budget proposals whilst dealing with an unprecedented level of Government cuts, regrets that the main opposition group have opposed numerous proposals without presenting the full details of their budget outlining the alternative cuts that they would make;
 - (q) believes that the main opposition group have acted irresponsibly through presenting factually inaccurate untruths about Council spending in an attempt to suggest that the Government's cuts can be made without impacting upon local services and believes that this is an attempt to

mislead local people; and

- (r) therefore calls on all opposition groups to present details of their budget to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee on 13th February, 2013, remembering that when they were the ruling group, the main opposition group stated “it would not be open or honest for any political group to present their proposed budget on the morning of Budget Council day”.

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a) to (o) and abstained on paragraphs (p) – (r) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHEILA CONSTANCE

Food Banks in Sheffield

It was moved by Councillor Shelia Constance, seconded by Councillor Sioned Mair Richards, that this Council:-

- (a) regrets that since this Government came to power there are more homeless people and people visiting food banks in Sheffield than ever before;
- (b) notes that the need for people to visit food banks has increased drastically over the past two years;
- (c) further notes that The Trussell Trust said its food bank network had fed almost 110,000 people since April 2012, compared with a total of 128,697 in the whole of 2011-12;
- (d) is aware that there are now seven food banks in Sheffield, which has more than doubled since the Coalition came to power;
- (e) is concerned about the disproportionate impact of homelessness on young people, who are more financially vulnerable and have less accommodation options open to them;
- (f) is doing what it can to help prevent homelessness in Sheffield but is faced with budget cuts which will mean less people will receive support when there is greater need;
- (g) believes that this need for emergency shelter and food supplies has increased due to tough economic pressures;
- (h) is aware that many families who need emergency food are working families that are struggling to pay bills as well as feed their families;

- (i) is also aware that the majority of people who need emergency food need help due to disruptions in benefit payments;
- (j) expects this situation to get worse with the introduction of universal benefits; and
- (k) is thankful that the churches and volunteer groups in Sheffield give up their time and resources to help people who need emergency support and hopes they will continue to do this.

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

1. the deletion in paragraph (a) of the words “this current Government came to power” and their substitution by the words “this economic downturn”;
2. the deletion of paragraphs (f) and (h) to (j);
3. the re-lettering of paragraphs (a) to (e) as new paragraphs (b) to (f), and the addition of a new paragraph (a) as follows:-
 - (a) reminds Members that the previous Government oversaw the most severe economic collapse in post-war British history and left this country on the brink of economic abyss;
4. the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (m) as follows:-
 - (h) recognises that despite 13 years in power, Labour politicians failed to tackle the root causes of homelessness, with 1.75 million people on social housing waiting lists and an estimated additional 380,000 ‘hidden homeless’ people in the UK;
 - (i) notes with concern, that under the previous Government, the building of social housing declined to the lowest figure since the Second World War, with seven times more prison cells being built than Council homes;
 - (j) furthermore, acknowledges the Council have so far spent less than 10% of the New Homes Bonus, a fund specifically targeted at encouraging more home building;
 - (k) welcomes moves by the Coalition Government to increase the building of social housing, and action taken by the last Council administration to build the first new Council homes in Sheffield for two decades;
 - (l) acknowledges specific moves by the Coalition Government to tackle homelessness, such as the recent £264,000 awarded to Sheffield charities, the Archer Project and ASSIST, and measures

in the Localism Act, which will allow homeless families to find a suitable home in the private rented sector and avoid the uncertainty of long waits in temporary accommodation;

- (m) supports broader Government initiatives, which have been welcomed by homeless charities, such as a cross-departmental Homelessness Working Group and the Health Inclusion Board, which will tackle chronic health problems among the homeless, and the new mental health strategy, *No Health without Mental Health*, which focuses on the needs of homeless people;

5. the re-lettering of original paragraph (k) as a new paragraph (n).

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

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

RESOLVED: that this Council:-

- (a) regrets that since this Government came to power there are more homeless people and people visiting food banks in Sheffield than ever before;
- (b) notes that the need for people to visit food banks has increased drastically over the past two years;
- (c) further notes that The Trussell Trust said its food bank network had fed almost 110,000 people since April 2012, compared with a total of 128,697 in the whole of 2011-12;
- (d) is aware that there are now seven food banks in Sheffield, which has more than doubled since the Coalition came to power;
- (e) is concerned about the disproportionate impact of homelessness on young people, who are more financially vulnerable and have less accommodation options open to them;
- (f) is doing what it can to help prevent homelessness in Sheffield but is faced with budget cuts which will mean less people will receive support when there is greater need;
- (g) believes that this need for emergency shelter and food supplies has increased due to tough economic pressures;
- (h) is aware that many families who need emergency food are working families that are struggling to pay bills as well as feed their families;
- (i) is also aware that the majority of people who need emergency food need help due to disruptions in benefit payments;

- (j) expects this situation to get worse with the introduction of universal benefits; and
- (k) is thankful that the churches and volunteer groups in Sheffield give up their time and resources to help people who need emergency support and hopes they will continue to do this.

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

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW SANGAR

Local Engagement and Community Empowerment

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with regret the proposal of the current Administration to abolish Community Assemblies;
- (b) believes Community Assemblies have been a wholly positive step for the Council in encouraging local engagement, strengthening local accountability, and empowering local councillors and communities;
- (c) furthermore, confirms that, despite the claims of the current Administration, the work of Community Assemblies and the number of residents engaged extends far beyond the formal meetings;
- (d) in addition, notes that a number a public sector organisations have aligned their structures to Community Assemblies to ensure better partnership working;
- (e) believes that the end of Community Assemblies would spell a return to the Town-Hall-knows-best attitude, where local concerns are increasingly ignored by Town Hall bureaucrats;
- (f) furthermore, regrets that the demise of Community Assemblies will lead to a further entrenchment of what is believed to be a 'favoured areas' policy and that, as a result, thousands of Sheffielders will not get a fair deal from the Council;
- (g) notes the comments of the Labour Chair of the Northern Community Assembly in The Sheffield Star that plans to cut Community Assemblies

were “regrettable”, “appalling”, “not an easy move” and “not something we wanted to do” and furthermore that the Assemblies have been “extremely valuable”;

- (h) feels that some funding should be retained to ensure Community Assemblies can continue to operate and support their communities;
- (i) however, believes that even if funding is withdrawn, the formal structures and branding of Community Assemblies should be retained; and
- (j) therefore, calls upon the Administration, regardless of the outcomes of the Budget Council meeting on 1st March, 2013, to maintain the broad structure of Community Assemblies with some officer support from the Council.

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

- (a) regrets that this Government is making unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and that the Council has had to reduce spending by £140 million over the past two years with a further £50 million for 2013/14;
- (b) is committed to local engagement and community empowerment, but believes that the unprecedented level of cuts that the Council is facing means that spending £2.4 million per year on locality engagement to the detriment of other services cannot be justified;
- (c) acknowledges that if this level of saving was not found from the locality engagement budget, it would need to be found by making cuts to other parts of the Council’s budget and believes it is disingenuous of the main opposition group to call upon the Council to protect Community Assemblies without offering any explanation as to which budgets they would cut;
- (d) will continue to encourage local engagement and community empowerment, however accepts that this will be with significantly reduced resources due to the unfair Government cuts that the Council is facing;
- (e) believes that the current Community Assembly system is flawed as it has failed to engage communities sufficiently and has as its main focus formal Assembly meetings which have often failed to attract the public or convince them that they were influencing decisions;
- (f) notes that Councillor David Baker, one of the Lib Dem architects of Community Assemblies, is reported within the write-up of a Sheffield for Democracy meeting, called to discuss Community Assemblies, on 23rd October, 2012, as offering the perspective that “Community Assemblies (other than the North East Community Assembly) have not operated as

intended”;

- (g) acknowledges that despite the flaws in the system, some good local work has been achieved by Community Assembly staff, local members and community groups;
- (h) believes that more of a focus on working at a ward level will encourage community engagement and participation;
- (i) notes that the initial consultation resulted in a wide range of views, with many constructive suggestions which will be considered carefully;
- (j) confirms that the work to develop the future model for local engagement and community empowerment is continuing and that there will be a second round of consultation with the intention of producing a system which maximises, as far as resources allow, local engagement and community empowerment, and supports partnership working in the City; and
- (k) further confirms that at first the new system will have to operate within a limited and reduced budget, but notes that in future, if more resources become available, it will be possible to enhance the new system through additional funding.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that this Government is making unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and that the Council has had to reduce spending by £140 million over the past two years with a further £50 million for 2013/14;
- (b) is committed to local engagement and community empowerment, but believes that the unprecedented level of cuts that the Council is facing means that spending £2.4 million per year on locality engagement to the detriment of other services cannot be justified;
- (c) acknowledges that if this level of saving was not found from the locality engagement budget, it would need to be found by making cuts to other parts of the Council’s budget and believes it is disingenuous of the main opposition group to call upon the Council to protect Community Assemblies without offering any explanation as to which budgets they would cut;
- (d) will continue to encourage local engagement and community empowerment, however accepts that this will be with significantly reduced resources due to the unfair Government cuts that the Council is facing;

- (e) believes that the current Community Assembly system is flawed as it has failed to engage communities sufficiently and has as its main focus formal Assembly meetings which have often failed to attract the public or convince them that they were influencing decisions;
- (f) notes that Councillor David Baker, one of the Lib Dem architects of Community Assemblies, is reported within the write-up of a Sheffield for Democracy meeting, called to discuss Community Assemblies, on 23rd October, 2012, as offering the perspective that “Community Assemblies (other than the North East Community Assembly) have not operated as intended”;
- (g) acknowledges that despite the flaws in the system, some good local work has been achieved by Community Assembly staff, local members and community groups;
- (h) believes that more of a focus on working at a ward level will encourage community engagement and participation;
- (i) notes that the initial consultation resulted in a wide range of views, with many constructive suggestions which will be considered carefully;
- (j) confirms that the work to develop the future model for local engagement and community empowerment is continuing and that there will be a second round of consultation with the intention of producing a system which maximises, as far as resources allow, local engagement and community empowerment, and supports partnership working in the City; and
- (k) further confirms that at first the new system will have to operate within a limited and reduced budget, but notes that in future, if more resources become available, it will be possible to enhance the new system through additional funding.

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (b), (d), (g) (h) (j) and (k) and abstained on paragraphs (a), (c), (e), (f) and (i) of the substantive motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HARRY HARPHAM

Local Government Funding

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Tony Damms, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that northern cities are being unfairly cut by this Government;

- (b) feels it is wrong, unfair and divisive that less affluent areas and cities are facing much bigger cuts than more affluent ones;
- (c) believes that this is demonstrated by recent research from Newcastle City Council which indicates that Sheffield will receive a cut of nearly £200 per person between 2010/11 and 2014/15, wealthy areas are receiving significantly less cuts with Guildford receiving a cut of just £24.14 per person, Wokingham £26.53 and Epsom and Ewell just £15.18;
- (d) is pleased to be working with the Core Cities group to represent England's eight largest city economies outside London to drive campaigns for a fair settlement;
- (e) supports the letter sent to Rt. Hon. Eric Pickles, MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining the unfair nature of cuts that are hitting the Core Cities and notes that the letter was signed by all Core City Leaders who all articulated concerns about the impact that the level of cuts that the Government are imposing on their budgets will have on Council services in all Core Cities;
- (f) welcomes the Come Together conference hosted in Liverpool on 18th January, 2013 attended by both political and faith leaders from cities across the country and supports the Sheffield representation at the event; and
- (g) resolves to continue to work constructively in partnership with other cities to stand up for the interests of our cities and hopes that the overwhelming objection to the Government's unfair policy of targeting cuts at areas of higher deprivation will lead to a reconsideration of this policy.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, seconded by Shaffaq Mohammed, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) to (c) and (e) to (g);
2. the re-lettering of paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (a); and
3. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-
 - (b) regrets that the previous Government chose to dedicate their time sucking up to hedge-fund managers in the City of London, ignoring the needs and potential of the Core Cities;
 - (c) notes the quotes of Polly Toynbee, specifically, "you can only be flabbergasted all over again at how Labour kowtowed to wealth, glorified the City and put all the nation's economic eggs into one dangerous basket";
 - (d) believes the previous Government failed to address the North/South

divide, leaving Northern cities overly dependent on the public sector and particularly vulnerable in a downturn;

- (e) supports the steps this Government has taken to rebalance the British economy, such as the recent announcement of the High Speed 2 rail line, alongside such policies as the Regional Growth Fund, Local Enterprise Partnerships, Enterprise Zones and University Technical Colleges;
- (f) believes contrasting the funding of a metropolitan borough with that of a shire district is a false analogy but – for the avoidance of doubt – notes that Sheffield will see a 3.9% reduction in its adjusted Formula Grant (including Early Intervention Grant and other funds), while Wokingham will see a reduction of 5.6%, Epsom & Ewell of 9.4% and Guildford of 7.8%;
- (g) further confirms that Sheffield City Council will have a spending power of £2,273 per dwelling next year compared to £1,845 for Wokingham, £306 for Epsom & Ewell and £284 for Guildford; and
- (h) resolves to continue working in partnership with other cities to ensure the Core Cities are the drivers of economic growth in our nation.

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

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

RESOLVED: that this Council

- (a) believes that northern cities are being unfairly cut by this Government;
- (b) feels it is wrong, unfair and divisive that less affluent areas and cities are facing much bigger cuts than more affluent ones;
- (c) believes that this is demonstrated by recent research from Newcastle City Council which indicates that Sheffield will receive a cut of nearly £200 per person between 2010/11 and 2014/15, wealthy areas are receiving significantly less cuts with Guildford receiving a cut of just £24.14 per person, Wokingham £26.53 and Epsom and Ewell just £15.18;
- (d) is pleased to be working with the Core Cities group to represent England's eight largest city economies outside London to drive campaigns for a fair settlement;
- (e) supports the letter sent to Rt. Hon. Eric Pickles, MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining the unfair nature of cuts that are hitting the Core Cities and notes that the letter was signed by all Core City Leaders who all articulated concerns about the impact that the level of cuts that the Government are imposing on their budgets will have on Council services in all Core Cities;

- (f) welcomes the Come Together conference hosted in Liverpool on 18th January, 2013 attended by both political and faith leaders from cities across the country and supports the Sheffield representation at the event; and
- (g) resolves to continue to work constructively in partnership with other cities to stand up for the interests of our cities and hopes that the overwhelming objection to the Government's unfair policy of targeting cuts at areas of higher deprivation will lead to a reconsideration of this policy.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACKIE DRAYTON

Early Years Review

It was moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, seconded by Councillor Denise Fox, that this Council:-

- (a) regrets that a further £6.8 million reduction to the Early Intervention Grant in the coming financial year, in addition to significant reductions to funding in previous years, indicates that Government cuts are being targeted directly at services to give children, young people and families the opportunity to fulfil their potential;
- (b) completely condemns the cuts to Early Intervention Grant and recalls warnings by sector leaders that these cuts would have a significant impact on services provided by local authorities;
- (c) supports the letter by the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister objecting to cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
- (d) regrets that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister refused to listen to warnings about cuts to Early Intervention Grant and included heavy reductions in the Local Government Finance Settlement;
- (e) acknowledges that proposals in the Early Years review include measures to deliver some of the savings necessitated by the Government's cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
- (f) further acknowledges that due to the level of the cuts to the Early Intervention Grant and the subsequent expansion of Free Early Learning, funding can no longer be identified for childcare sustainability and the Early Years Review therefore includes proposals to end grants to 16 childcare providers which is a continuation of the policy adopted by the previous Administration and notes comments by the previous Cabinet

Member for Children, Young People and Families and current Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group in The Star newspaper on 7th January 2011 "We will have significantly less money than we previously had so we have to ensure we are putting it to the best possible use, supporting the most disadvantaged families, ... Tough economic times can give new opportunities to review how services are provided and to question if they are being provided in the most efficient way. It is about getting better value for money. Our funding needs to be redirected so those most in need are benefiting directly. ... Centres will have to charge market rates for their services if their parents can afford them."

- (g) regrets the potential impact that the removal of grants from the 16 childcare providers will have on their organisations, however acknowledges that this is ultimately a consequence of the Government's decision to cut the Early Intervention Grant so heavily, as stated by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families that "we will have significantly less money than we previously had";
- (h) is committed to making sure childcare is available in all areas across the City and understands that whilst changes in Government policy direct a change in the Council's role towards a market facilitator, the Early Years Review identifies that temporary arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that early years provision can continue in the transitional period in between the ending of current arrangements and the expansion of Free Early Learning and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January, 2013;
- (i) notes that the Early Years Review indicates longer term proposals to ensure that all providers are given the help they need to develop a sustainable business model and maximise the funding opportunities available following changes in Government policy and the development of Free Early Learning;
- (j) further notes that proposals in the Early Years Review also include changes to the organisation and management of Sheffield's Children's Centres, however, acknowledges that proposals in this area are to make savings to management, administration and premises costs and not to reduce the number of outlets in which services are provided, noting the statement in the Cabinet Report that there will be little impact on current service delivery to parents, however, understands that the locations of where this support is provided may change;
- (k) further notes that details of service provision following the organisational changes will be made available and any changes to locations of support will be effectively communicated to parents and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January; and
- (l) further notes that any future proposals agreed following the consultation period will be subject to further scrutiny.

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

- (a) notes the Redesign of Early Years Services agreed by the Cabinet on 12th December, 2012;
- (b) highlights that thanks to Liberal Democrat policy of 15 hours Free Early Learning for disadvantaged 2-year-olds, £3.8 million of new funding will be invested in Sheffield next year;
- (c) yet recognises that, given funding reforms, changes have to be made to the way early years services are provided in the City;
- (d) believes the relevant Cabinet Member should not have dithered for over a year on the Early Years Review, and should have come forward earlier with concrete proposals, so that providers and parents would have longer to adapt;
- (e) is dismayed that the Cabinet are still yet to publish key details of the future model, such as how the 17 Children's Centre Areas will work in practice, with just weeks to go until the implementation of a new system;
- (f) furthermore, highlights the threats facing voluntary and community sector organisations in adapting to the new funding system and regrets the complete lack of support that has been provided to centres who are facing a potential cliff-edge in funding;
- (g) believes local parents and providers are simply not getting a fair deal from this Council;
- (h) therefore, understands the local anger at the Cabinet, given the pitiful consultation process, which amount to an insult to parents and providers across the City;
- (i) thanks campaigners for fighting with dignity and determination to protect local services;
- (j) regrets that the work of campaigners has been subject, in the words of one campaigner, to a "flippant and derogatory reference" by the Leader of the Council and hopes the Leader of the Council will apologise;
- (k) is not surprised, given this context, that the Children, Young People and Families Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, voted unanimously to return this proposal to Cabinet for further consideration of the details of the proposals;
- (l) believes this vote, which contained members of the Administration's group, serves as a damning assessment of the Cabinet Member for

Children, Young People and Families; and

- (m) urges the Cabinet to immediately adopt the recommendations of the Children, Young People and Families Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, specifically that the Cabinet:
- (i) considers what transitional arrangements are needed to be put in place to ensure that good quality early years provision is able to be sustained; and
 - (ii) provides further details of provision within the 17 areas, and gives assurances that a comprehensive communications plan is developed to inform parents of the locations of support, and the type of support available, in the 17 new areas.

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

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (f) as follows:-
 - (c) notes increasing evidence that the environment of children in their early years is crucial to their development into contented and rounded adults;
 - (d) believes that the provisional decision to cut funding to the voluntary sector providers was made without consultation with either the providers or their service users;
 - (e) believes that placing early years providers at risk, many of whom have received an "outstanding" grade from Ofsted, is unacceptable given the potential for disruption of many vital services to communities in real need;
 - (f) therefore requests the Cabinet to set aside the current proposals and properly consult with communities about the models of support they require;
2. the re-lettering of paragraph (l) as a new paragraph (g).

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

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

RESOLVED: that this Council

- (a) regrets that a further £6.8 million reduction to the Early Intervention Grant in the coming financial year, in addition to significant reductions to funding

- in previous years, indicates that Government cuts are being targeted directly at services to give children, young people and families the opportunity to fulfil their potential;
- (b) completely condemns the cuts to Early Intervention Grant and recalls warnings by sector leaders that these cuts would have a significant impact on services provided by local authorities;
 - (c) supports the letter by the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister objecting to cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
 - (d) regrets that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister refused to listen to warnings about cuts to Early Intervention Grant and included heavy reductions in the Local Government Finance Settlement;
 - (e) acknowledges that proposals in the Early Years review include measures to deliver some of the savings necessitated by the Government's cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
 - (f) further acknowledges that due to the level of the cuts to the Early Intervention Grant and the subsequent expansion of Free Early Learning, funding can no longer be identified for childcare sustainability and the Early Years Review therefore includes proposals to end grants to 16 childcare providers which is a continuation of the policy adopted by the previous Administration and notes comments by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families and current Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group in The Star newspaper on 7th January 2011 "We will have significantly less money than we previously had so we have to ensure we are putting it to the best possible use, supporting the most disadvantaged families, ... Tough economic times can give new opportunities to review how services are provided and to question if they are being provided in the most efficient way. It is about getting better value for money. Our funding needs to be redirected so those most in need are benefiting directly. ... Centres will have to charge market rates for their services if their parents can afford them."
 - (g) regrets the potential impact that the removal of grants from the 16 childcare providers will have on their organisations, however acknowledges that this is ultimately a consequence of the Government's decision to cut the Early Intervention Grant so heavily, as stated by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families that "we will have significantly less money than we previously had";
 - (h) is committed to making sure childcare is available in all areas across the City and understands that whilst changes in Government policy direct a change in the Council's role towards a market facilitator, the Early Years Review identifies that temporary arrangements need to be put in place to

ensure that early years provision can continue in the transitional period in between the ending of current arrangements and the expansion of Free Early Learning and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January, 2013;

- (i) notes that the Early Years Review indicates longer term proposals to ensure that all providers are given the help they need to develop a sustainable business model and maximise the funding opportunities available following changes in Government policy and the development of Free Early Learning;
- (j) further notes that proposals in the Early Years Review also include changes to the organisation and management of Sheffield's Children's Centres, however, acknowledges that proposals in this area are to make savings to management, administration and premises costs and not to reduce the number of outlets in which services are provided, noting the statement in the Cabinet Report that there will be little impact on current service delivery to parents, however, understands that the locations of where this support is provided may change;
- (k) further notes that details of service provision following the organisational changes will be made available and any changes to locations of support will be effectively communicated to parents and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January; and
- (l) further notes that any future proposals agreed following the consultation period will be subject to further scrutiny.

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (l) and against all of the remaining paragraphs of the above motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS

Early Years Review (2)

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the Redesign of Early Years Services agreed by the Cabinet on 12th December, 2012;
- (b) understands the anger from parents and providers at the proposals, given the pitiful consultation process and the ongoing lack of detail regarding the future model;
- (c) is dismayed that the Cabinet are still yet to publish details of how the future 17 Children's Centre Areas will work in practice, with just weeks to

go until the implementation of a new system;

- (d) highlights that thanks to Liberal Democrat policy of 15 hours Free Early Learning for disadvantaged 2-year-olds, £3.8 million of new funding will be invested in Sheffield next year;
- (e) however, regrets the lack of support that has been provided to voluntary and community sector organisations to adapt to the new funding system, leaving many facing a potential cliff-edge in funding;
- (f) believes local parents and providers are not getting a fair deal from this Council;
- (g) notes the recommendations of the Children, Young People and Families Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, agreed by all Labour members, specifically that the Cabinet:
 - (i) considers what transitional arrangements are needed to be put in place to ensure that good quality early years provision is able to be sustained; and
 - (ii) provides further details of provision within the 17 areas, and gives assurances that a comprehensive communications plan is developed to inform parents of the locations of support, and the type of support available, in the 17 new areas; and
- (h) calls upon the Cabinet to seriously reconsider their proposals for local children's centres in line with the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations.

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

- (a) regrets that a further £6.8 million reduction to the Early Intervention Grant in the coming financial year, in addition to significant reductions to funding in previous years, indicates that Government cuts are being targeted directly at services to give children, young people and families the opportunity to fulfil their potential;
- (b) completely condemns the cuts to Early Intervention Grant and recalls warnings by sector leaders that these cuts would have a significant impact on services provided by local authorities;
- (c) supports the letter by the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister objecting to cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
- (d) regrets that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local

Government and the Deputy Prime Minister refused to listen to warnings about cuts to Early Intervention Grant and included heavy reductions in the Local Government Finance Settlement;

- (e) acknowledges that proposals in the Early Years review include measures to deliver some of the savings necessitated by the Government's cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
- (f) further acknowledges that due to the level of the cuts to the Early Intervention Grant and the subsequent expansion of Free Early Learning, funding can no longer be identified for childcare sustainability and the Early Years Review therefore includes proposals to end grants to 16 childcare providers which is a continuation of the policy adopted by the previous Administration and notes comments by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families and current Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group in The Star newspaper on 7th January 2011 "We will have significantly less money than we previously had so we have to ensure we are putting it to the best possible use, supporting the most disadvantaged families, ... Tough economic times can give new opportunities to review how services are provided and to question if they are being provided in the most efficient way. It is about getting better value for money. Our funding needs to be redirected so those most in need are benefiting directly. ... Centres will have to charge market rates for their services if their parents can afford them."
- (g) regrets the potential impact that the removal of grants from the 16 childcare providers will have on their organisations, however acknowledges that this is ultimately a consequence of the Government's decision to cut the Early Intervention Grant so heavily, as stated by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families that "we will have significantly less money than we previously had";
- (h) is committed to making sure childcare is available in all areas across the City and understands that whilst changes in Government policy direct a change in the Council's role towards a market facilitator, the Early Years Review identifies that temporary arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that early years provision can continue in the transitional period in between the ending of current arrangements and the expansion of Free Early Learning and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January, 2013;
- (i) notes that the Early Years Review indicates longer term proposals to ensure that all providers are given the help they need to develop a sustainable business model and maximise the funding opportunities available following changes in Government policy and the development of Free Early Learning;
- (j) further notes that proposals in the Early Years Review also include changes to the organisation and management of Sheffield's Children's Centres, however, acknowledges that proposals in this area are to make

savings to management, administration and premises costs and not to reduce the number of outlets in which services are provided, noting the statement in the Cabinet Report that there will be little impact on current service delivery to parents, however, understands that the locations of where this support is provided may change;

- (k) further notes that details of service provision following the organisational changes will be made available and any changes to locations of support will be effectively communicated to parents and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January; and
- (l) further notes that any future proposals agreed following the consultation period will be subject to further scrutiny.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that a further £6.8 million reduction to the Early Intervention Grant in the coming financial year, in addition to significant reductions to funding in previous years, indicates that Government cuts are being targeted directly at services to give children, young people and families the opportunity to fulfil their potential;
- (b) completely condemns the cuts to Early Intervention Grant and recalls warnings by sector leaders that these cuts would have a significant impact on services provided by local authorities;
- (c) supports the letter by the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister objecting to cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
- (d) regrets that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Deputy Prime Minister refused to listen to warnings about cuts to Early Intervention Grant and included heavy reductions in the Local Government Finance Settlement;
- (e) acknowledges that proposals in the Early Years review include measures to deliver some of the savings necessitated by the Government's cuts to the Early Intervention Grant;
- (f) further acknowledges that due to the level of the cuts to the Early Intervention Grant and the subsequent expansion of Free Early Learning, funding can no longer be identified for childcare sustainability and the Early Years Review therefore includes proposals to end grants to 16 childcare providers which is a continuation of the policy adopted by the

previous Administration and notes comments by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families and current Deputy Leader of the Main Opposition Group in The Star newspaper on 7th January 2011 "We will have significantly less money than we previously had so we have to ensure we are putting it to the best possible use, supporting the most disadvantaged families, ... Tough economic times can give new opportunities to review how services are provided and to question if they are being provided in the most efficient way. It is about getting better value for money. Our funding needs to be redirected so those most in need are benefiting directly. ... Centres will have to charge market rates for their services if their parents can afford them."

- (g) regrets the potential impact that the removal of grants from the 16 childcare providers will have on their organisations, however acknowledges that this is ultimately a consequence of the Government's decision to cut the Early Intervention Grant so heavily, as stated by the previous Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families that "we will have significantly less money than we previously had";
- (h) is committed to making sure childcare is available in all areas across the City and understands that whilst changes in Government policy direct a change in the Council's role towards a market facilitator, the Early Years Review identifies that temporary arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that early years provision can continue in the transitional period in between the ending of current arrangements and the expansion of Free Early Learning and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January, 2013;
- (i) notes that the Early Years Review indicates longer term proposals to ensure that all providers are given the help they need to develop a sustainable business model and maximise the funding opportunities available following changes in Government policy and the development of Free Early Learning;
- (j) further notes that proposals in the Early Years Review also include changes to the organisation and management of Sheffield's Children's Centres, however, acknowledges that proposals in this area are to make savings to management, administration and premises costs and not to reduce the number of outlets in which services are provided, noting the statement in the Cabinet Report that there will be little impact on current service delivery to parents, however, understands that the locations of where this support is provided may change;
- (k) further notes that details of service provision following the organisational changes will be made available and any changes to locations of support will be effectively communicated to parents and welcomes that this was reconfirmed at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 24th January; and
- (l) further notes that any future proposals agreed following the consultation period will be subject to further scrutiny.

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK SCOTT

Gritters and Snow Wardens

It was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Ibrar Hussain, that this Council:-

- (a) would like to thank the Gritters and Snow Wardens on behalf of the Council and the people of Sheffield for all their hard work keeping Sheffield's roads safe through the bad weather;
- (b) appreciates that Community Snow Wardens are unpaid volunteers who give up their time to help their local communities;
- (c) acknowledges the unprecedented bad weather we have had and would like to reassure residents we will do our best to combat any further snow in the City;
- (d) is pleased there have been no major incidents throughout the bad weather; and
- (e) urges this Government to look seriously at climate change which has led to this unprecedented cold spell in the UK.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (e);
2. the re-lettering of paragraphs (c) and (d) as new paragraphs (d) and (e) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
 - (c) praises the previous Administration for introducing the Snow Warden Scheme and regrets the repeated refusals of this Administration to expand the Scheme at minimal cost;
3. the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (h) as follows:-
 - (f) notes that, while individual extreme weather events cannot be attributed to climate change with any confidence, climate change is expected to increase the frequency and severity of such events;
 - (g) regrets that previous Governments refused to take warnings of climate change seriously; and
 - (h) commends the influence of Liberal Democrats in Government in addressing climate change, through measures such as the ground-

breaking Green Deal, which the Council's Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene described as "fantastic news for Sheffield".

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

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (g) and (f), against paragraph (h) and abstained on paragraph (a) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: that this Council:-

- (a) would like to thank the Gritters and Snow Wardens on behalf of the Council and the people of Sheffield for all their hard work keeping Sheffield's roads safe through the bad weather;
- (b) appreciates that Community Snow Wardens are unpaid volunteers who give up their time to help their local communities;
- (c) acknowledges the unprecedented bad weather we have had and would like to reassure residents we will do our best to combat any further snow in the City;
- (d) is pleased there have been no major incidents throughout the bad weather; and
- (e) urges this Government to look seriously at climate change which has led to this unprecedented cold spell in the UK.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and abstained on paragraphs (d) and (e) of the above Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) and abstained on paragraph (e) of the motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN ROBSON

Badger Culling

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

- (a) opposes the Government's decision to cull badgers in England;

- (b) is aware of strong objections to badger culling in the UK which resulted in a petition of over 150,000 people;
- (c) notes that Parliament voted against the cull in October 2012 with a huge majority of 147 votes to 28;
- (d) regrets the u-turn taken by Government to cull between 70-95% of the country's badgers with over 7,500 condemned in pilot studies in West Gloucestershire and West Somerset set to go ahead this summer;
- (e) acknowledges that despite contradicting statements there is strong scientific evidence that culling badgers will not make a difference to the numbers of bovine TB;
- (f) notes that leading scientists in this field agree that a cull will make little or no difference and that free shooting has not been scientifically tested anywhere and could even spread bovine TB in the short term as badgers move around more;
- (g) reminds the Government that badgers are a legally protected species and to kill them without knowing the full facts is a disgrace;
- (h) will not voluntarily allow badger culling on land in its ownership if the cull is extended after the pilot scheme; and
- (i) urges the Government to reconsider the decision as there is no scientific, economic or moral basis for culling.

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ALISON BRELSFORD

Stocksbridge Leisure Centre

It was moved by Councillor Alison Brelsford, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the decision of the Cabinet in October 2011 to remove £200,000 of refurbishment funding from Stocksbridge Leisure Centre;
- (b) believes this decision formed part of a long-term plan by the Administration to deny the people of Stocksbridge their leisure centre;
- (c) highlights that Stocksbridge is unique in its isolated location and its lack of public transport links to other leisure sites;
- (d) notes that while the Administration are proposing to close leisure facilities in Sheffield, the Coalition Government is investing £10million Olympic Legacy funding in leisure facilities across the City;

- (e) feels that Stocksbridge is not getting a fair deal from this Council; and
- (f) calls upon the Administration to reconsider their proposals for Stocksbridge Leisure Centre.

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

- (a) regrets that the Council has had to propose removing the subsidy from Stocksbridge Leisure Centre in order to balance its budget in 2013/14;
- (b) welcomes the development of a partnership between Sheffield City Council and Stocksbridge Town Council to look at options for the future provision of leisure services for Stocksbridge;
- (c) thanks Sport England for their support for a short independent study to help us look at all options;
- (d) welcomes the Council's decision to provide additional funding for Stocksbridge Leisure Centre into 2013/14 to allow three months for options to be developed;
- (e) deeply regrets that this Government is making unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and that the Council has had to reduce spending by £140 million over the past two years with a further £50 million for 2013/14; and
- (f) recognises that the present Administration is acting responsibly to protect services as far as possible, however, due to the scale of the cuts the Council is facing, it will have to make some difficult decisions and unfortunately the proposed withdrawal of subsidy and possible closure of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre is one of these.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (g) and (h) as follows:-

- (g) notes the minutes of Stocksbridge Town Council on 10th November, 2011 that Councillor Philip Wood "gave assurances that [Stocksbridge Leisure Centre] would stay open";
- (h) believes that these remarks were misleading prior to a local election and hopes Councillor Wood will apologise for his remarks

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that the Council has had to propose removing the subsidy from Stocksbridge Leisure Centre in order to balance its budget in 2013/14;
- (b) welcomes the development of a partnership between Sheffield City Council and Stocksbridge Town Council to look at options for the future provision of leisure services for Stocksbridge;
- (c) thanks Sport England for their support for a short independent study to help us look at all options;
- (d) welcomes the Council's decision to provide additional funding for Stocksbridge Leisure Centre into 2013/14 to allow three months for options to be developed;
- (e) deeply regrets that this Government is making unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and that the Council has had to reduce spending by £140 million over the past two years with a further £50 million for 2013/14; and
- (f) recognises that the present Administration is acting responsibly to protect services as far as possible, however, due to the scale of the cuts the Council is facing, it will have to make some difficult decisions and unfortunately the proposed withdrawal of subsidy and possible closure of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre is one of these.

19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NIKKI SHARPE

Mary Seacole and the National Curriculum

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Nikki Sharpe, seconded by Councillor Mary Lea, that this Council:-

- (a) supports the Early Day Motion proposed by Alan Meale MP to Keep Mary Seacole on the national curriculum;
- (b) is aware of history which records the many heroic and compassionate acts carried out unselfishly by renowned war nursing heroine Mary Seacole for innumerable wounded soldiers injured on the Crimean War's bloody battlefields;
- (c) notes her efforts have rightly become part of the nation's schools educational curriculum with further recognition of her contribution shortly to be revealed by the unveiling of a large bronze statue in her memory to be erected in the grounds of St Thomas' Hospital facing the Houses of

Parliament;

- (d) is therefore greatly alarmed by reports that the Secretary of State for Education has announced plans to overhaul the core history content taught to our nation's schoolchildren which won't include the story of her exploits on behalf of others;
- (e) further notes that the teaching of Black historical figures is widely recognised to be beneficial to the success of Black pupils and in closing the GCSE achievement gap and indeed it is to the advantage of pupils from all backgrounds in our increasingly diverse schools and society, and that Mary Seacole, as a Jamaican/Scottish figure, is a positive role model and is well-respected in NHS circles;
- (f) is also aware that Mary Seacole is the only Black figure to feature in the national curriculum not connected to civil rights or enslavement and removing someone who was voted by the public the Greatest Black Briton (100greatblackbritons.com) sends out the wrong signals, and believes we should be taught more Black history not less;
- (g) believes the children of Sheffield, and indeed the nation, are best served by being reminded of such unselfishness and hopes the Secretary of State will desist in his attempt to undermine her memory; and
- (h) calls upon our local Members of Parliament to support the campaign to lobby the Government to retain inclusion of Mary Seacole in the national curriculum.