

# 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 5 November 2014, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

## PRESENT

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

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nasima Akther Nikki Bond Qurban Hussain
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Stuart Wattam Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms Gill Furniss
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain Talib Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Tim Rippon	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Harry Harpham Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Jenny Armstrong Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Ray Satur

**1. FORMER COUNCILLOR GEORGE COOPER**

The Lord Mayor reported the recent death of former Councillor George Cooper who had served as a Labour Councillor representing the Walkley Ward from 1952 to 1965. He served as the Chair of the Housing Management Committee between 1959 and 1962. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in memory of former Councillor Cooper. Later in the meeting, a tribute was paid to him.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sheila Constance, Rob Frost, Alan Law and Jackie Satur.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 Members of the City Council declared interests in items of business, as follows:-

3.2 Item 4 on the Summons: (Petition Requiring Debate) Petition regarding the Learning Disability Services Residential Contract

Councillor John Campbell declared a personal interest in the item as he had been involved in the campaign in his role as Unison Staff Side Chair and indicated that he would leave the meeting and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Councillor Mick Rooney declared a disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the item as he was a Non-Executive Director, Sheffield Health and Social Care NHS Foundation Trust and indicated that he would leave the meeting and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

3.3 Item 15 on the Summons: Notice of Motion Given by Councillor Leigh Bramall Concerning Rail Franchise Requirements

Councillor Julie Dore declared a personal interest in the item as she was a Director of Rail North.

3.4 Item 18 on the Summons: Notice of Motion Given by Councillor John Booker Concerning the National Health Service

Members of the Council declared personal interests in the above item on the following grounds:-

- |                         |   |                               |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Councillor Joe Otten    | - | As his wife was a GP          |
| Councillor Penny Baker  | - | As she was an NHS pensioner   |
| Councillor Gill Furniss | - | As she was an employee of NHS |

- Councillor Harry Harpham - As his wife was an employee of the NHS
- Councillor Mary Lea - As she was an employee of the NHS
- Councillor David Barker - As he and his wife were employees of the NHS
- Councillor Qurban Hussain - As he was an NHS Pensioner
- Councillor Ben Curran - As his wife was an employee of the NHS
- Councillor Richard Shaw - As his wife was a student nurse
- Councillor Jillian Creasy - As she had been an employee of the NHS
- Councillor Philip Wood - As his partner was an employee of the NHS
- Councillor Katie Condliffe - On the grounds of her employment.
- Councillor Denise Reaney - As she was an NHS pensioner

The following Members declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Item 18:-

- Councillor Sue Alston - As she was an employee of the NHS and her Membership of the Royal College of Midwives.
- Councillor Andrew Sangar - As his partner was an employee of the NHS and was a Member of the Royal College of Midwives.

#### **4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

Resolved: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 1 October 2014 be approved as a correct record.

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

##### **5.1 Petitions**

##### **5.1.1 Petition Objecting to Planning Application 14/03473/FUL – 162 to 170 Devonshire Street**

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 18,691 signatures and objecting to Planning Application 14/03473/FUL – 162 to 170 Devonshire Street.

On behalf of the petitioners, Jonathan Butcher addressed the Council. He stated that the petition related to the proposed planning application to demolish properties on Devonshire Street and erect a 3 storey building in their place. There was concern that the proposals would affect the cultural landscape and identity of the area. The petition had reached over 18 thousand signatories in a short time and there were 600 written objections on the planning area of the Council Website. Independent businesses were a vital part of the City economy and the cultural scene, including the area of Devonshire Street was an important aspect of students choosing to live and study in Sheffield and was also important in attracting small and medium sized business to the City and to investors. The properties were part of the City's identity.

The change of class use from retail to leisure was also of concern and the social and economic advantages of such a change of use were open to question. There might also be anti-social behaviour arising from a change to leisure use. He said that other areas of the city centre might be a more appropriate location for such a development to take place and drew attention to the amount of opposition to the proposals.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall stated that he agreed that the Devonshire Quarter was a valuable area of the City, as were other places including the Antiques Quarter and Kelham Island, which were also attractive to people. He stated that the Council had a statutory duty to consider every planning application. The Council Website listing indicated only that an application had been received. It did not denote that an application had been approved, nor that the matter had been considered. The Council's Planning and Highways Committee made decisions on planning applications, on the basis of a report and officer recommendations and national planning law was used to determine applications.

He acknowledged the public concerns which had been brought to the Council's attention and said that anyone concerned or against the application should submit objections. The decision would be made by the Committee, which comprised all political groups on the Council. The public interest and strength of feeling on this proposal was evident and the application would be dealt with as quickly as possible. However, Councillor Bramall stated that he could not predetermine the outcome of the application, which was subject to the quasi-judicial process of the Planning Committee.

#### 5.1.2 Petition Requesting the Reinstatement of the Free Bee Bus Service

The Council received a petition containing 488 signatures requesting the reinstatement of the Free Bee bus service.

On behalf of the petitioners, Jackie Milner addressed the Council. She stated that she represented Sheffield Pensioners Action Group and had been informed that 14 buses serviced the bottom of the Moor and Moor Markets. She said that she was fortunate in that the bus service which she used did go to the Moor Market.

People were saying that there was not information to tell them which bus they should catch to get to the bottom of the Moor. This was having an impact on the success of the Moor Market and Market Traders were also concerned. It was suggested that signs should at least be produced to tell people which bus to catch and from where in order to travel to the Moor Market.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall acknowledged the concerns expressed about the withdrawal of the Freebee Bus service. He said this had been a decision made by the South Yorkshire Transport Authority and had been brought about by the budget cuts, which meant that the Transport Authority had less money to spend.

The issue was how the bus services bound for the Moor Market could be promoted. Bus operators already charged a 50 pence flat rate for bus journeys made within the City Centre. He agreed that the lack of information concerning bus services and fares was a problem and it needed to be examined. The Market did have a marketing budget with which to carry out promotion and Councillor Bramall stated that he would speak with the relevant people with a view to improving the information regarding bus services to the Moor Market.

### 5.1.3 Petition Objecting to the Proposed Construction of a Tesco Express Store in Stannington

The Council received a petition containing 884 signatures, objecting to the proposed construction of a Tesco Express store in Stannington.

On behalf of the petitioners, Clare Probert addressed the Council. She stated that work had begun on the conversion of the former public house in Stannington to a Tesco store and it was understood that planning permission would be required for some elements of the new store.

People objected to the Tesco store on several grounds, including the potential noise problems and other behaviours associated with the sale of alcohol. The benefit of a cash machine at the premises was also brought into question, as there was already such a facility in the village. The location of the development was on a blind bend and there was concern for road safety and particularly that of pedestrians. She asked whether a pedestrian crossing would be included in the proposals. There was also concern as to how deliveries would be made to the store and the road safety implications of increased traffic brought into the area by customers. She said it was local people and local business which would be most affected by the creation of the Tesco store and she asked what was the benefit of the development for local people.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall stated that, whilst he was not familiar with the details, he would refer the matter to the Council's planning officers. He explained that there was national planning law and, within that framework, some issues were not material considerations. The Council as planning authority did not have powers to refuse an application on the grounds of

a change of use in this instance. Permissions would be required if there were significant external changes proposed.

In relation to the matters raised as regards licensing, Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, stated that Licensing Objectives were a consideration, in the granting of a premises licence and one of these was the prevention of crime and disorder. If there were problems relating to premises including noise and crime and disorder, a request could be made for a review of the license, for which evidence would be required.

#### 5.1.4 Petition Regarding the use of Totley Scout Hut by Wild at Play

The Council received a petition containing 214 signatures complaining about the use of Totley Scout Hut by Wild at Play.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Avril Critchley who stated that the Scout hut was sub-let to Wild at Play, but it was believed that this was in breach of the terms of the lease. There had been no consultation or consent given regarding the use of the Scout hut for the purposes to which it was put by Wild at Play. The hut was used from 7.30 am until 6.00pm Monday to Friday. Activities which took place included: birthday parties, a before school club, toddler club and kinder club, after school club and holiday camps. Ofsted, having inspected the facility had said it was not adequate. There was some encroachment into the adjacent field, without permission and conservation work in the wood was at risk. The lighting of fires caused discomfort and had health implications. Some trees had been cut down and there was concern for the flora at that location, including the bluebells, which were a protected species.

Noise and parking problems affected residents and there was also concern regarding the welfare of rabbits and hens. Several departments of the City Council had been contacted with regard to these issues and it was understood that investigations were being led by Kier. A meeting had taken place on 7 October 2014, the outcome of which was awaited.

There were too many children on the site and whilst the value of the provision was understood, it was felt that this particular location was the wrong place to accommodate that number of children as it had an adverse effect on local residents. She stated that the Scouts had previously used the site in peace and harmony with local people.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council. Councillor Dore stated that she had received a letter concerning this matter on 6 October 2014, which was investigated. She acknowledged that some of the activities which were provided for children and young people at the site might be welcome. However, there was an issue regarding the unauthorised use of the Scout Hut. A planning contravention notice was issued in relation to the site.

Councillor Dore stated that she had this morning received the result of the meeting which had taken place on 7 October. The Scouts Association had served

a 3 month notice on Wild About Play to vacate the site. It would be for the Scouts to consider the best use of the building. She had been assured that the Scouts Association would consider what was required with regard to the site in future and would consult with residents.

5.1.5 Petition requesting the reinstatement of the “Lollipop Lady” outside Ann’s Grove School

The Council received a paper petition containing approximately 150 signatures requesting the reinstatement of the lollipop lady outside Ann’s Grove School.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Rachael Crolla who stated that the petitioners were requesting the reinstatement of the lollipop lady, who had given service outside Ann’s Grove School for 13 years. She informed the Council that since the submission of the petition, the lady had now been reinstated at that location.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene. Councillor Scott stated that he had spoken with local ward Councillors and with the Headteacher. He noted that the school had been most helpful in finding a solution to this matter. It had been proposed that the School Crossing Patrol Warden in question would move to Bankwood Primary School. Local Councillors had agreed to fund a School Crossing Patrol post at Ann’s Grove School. However, he did not wish to leave Bankwood School without a school crossing patrol and wanted to recruit to the vacant post as soon as possible. Councillor Scott proposed that he meet with the petitioners to discuss the matter further.

5.2 Public Questions

5.2.1 Public Question Concerning Question and Answer Protocols

Marcus O’Hagan stated that he had asked a number of questions to Council in the past few years concerning child protection, safeguarding and libraries. He said that he was prevented from putting questions on a child protection issue and raised this at a recent meeting of Council. He had made suggestions regarding protocols and follow up procedures for people who weren’t satisfied with the answers given.

He informed the Council that Councillor Iqbal had met him today to make an appointment with the Leader of the Council.

He said that he had not received satisfactory answers to over 20 questions which he had put to the Council. He said that he had received correspondence from the Council asserting that the ICO (Information Commissioner’s Office) had instructed the Council not to process requests for review.

He asked the following questions:

1. Can the Council provide documentation regarding the instruction from the

Information Commissioner

2. What does the Council consider the effect on this citizen and democracy in the City will be
3. He stated that the Leader of the Council has stated that any member of Cabinet found to be deliberately misleading her group within the Council would be removed from office. With reference to questions which he had put to Councillor Iqbal, Mr O'Hagan said he had only one record of response, and that was regarding a petition. He asked will the Leader be taking appropriate action
4. Given this record, are we to assume or expect that Ed Vaizey has been treated similarly?

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families stated, in reference to Mr O'Hagan's assertion that he had been prevented from putting a question concerning child protection, that the Council took any question concerning child protection very seriously. She referred to the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 3 September 2014. At that meeting, Mr O'Hagan had said there was a flawed procedure and in response, he had been told that if he wishes to take up any such matter with the Council then he should do so and Councillor Drayton had invited him to inform her of any specific concerns about a safeguarding matter. The Council had a dedicated service and it was expected that the service would respond to all enquiries. If this process was not working, then the Council must investigate such concerns. Councillor Drayton stated that Mr O'Hagan had not contacted her.

Councillor Julie Dore stated that if a matter was confidential or sensitive and regarding an individual, then the Council would not respond in public but a response would be made in private to any matter which needed to be addressed and especially if this related to child protection.

She apologised that she had said that a meeting would be arranged with Mr O'Hagan and this had not been done. Councillor Iqbal had now spoken with Mr O'Hagan and a meeting would be arranged to address the issues which he raised and other questions so that he received a proper response to them.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health, stated that he was sorry that Mr O'Hagan felt that he had not provided full answers to questions he had raised and he said these could be answered at the forthcoming meeting. He would request that Council officers were also present at that meeting.

#### 5.2.2 Public Question Concerning Job Creation

Jose Angel Garcia stated that employability was one of the main issues in the City. He asked why the Council had a Senior Officer Employment Committee and not a City Employment Committee dealing with this issue.

Mr Garcia referred to the Notice of Motion on the agenda and the Strategic Economic Plan of which one of the most important points was the creation of 70 thousand jobs in 10 years. He said almost nothing was said about the

employability of people with disabilities. He asked which strategies were proposed in this regard and what will be new or different?

He asked how programs like the City Deal can work without collaboration with employers and businesses. He asked how feasible it would be to provide tax incentives to those wishing to open a business in a location which had been empty for years or for a business which will hire disabled people.

Mr Garcia asked how the Council would play a role in championing mental health issues.

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, stated that the Strategic Economic Plan did not include detail on employability. It focussed upon economic growth, investment, how to attract jobs and access to jobs. There was a committee for Sheffield for employment, which was the Work and Skills Board, which he chaired and which included representatives of the universities and colleges. The Board fed Sheffield's views to the City Region. There was also private sector representation on the Local Enterprise Partnership.

With regard to employment for disabled people, there was the progress to work scheme which was being worked up at present, to help people with disabilities achieve well. A national pilot was also in place to help target people on disability support allowance and this was being progressed with the Clinical Commissioning Group and Job Centre Plus. A scheme would be launched next year to facilitate business use of empty premises.

Councillor Bramall stated that he would be able to provide more detail in writing to Mr Garcia, if he so wished

### 5.2.3 Public Questions Concerning Winter Gritting

Sandra Butler asked how much money was being saved by not gritting on Blindsight Lane.

Grace Windle stated that she had been in contact with Councillor Jack Scott and the Chief Executive of the Council. She asked a question concerning the criteria for gritting a road and why 4 grit bins had been installed on Blindsight Lane. She said that people's lives were potentially in danger and the road was steep and sharp and commented that there was supposedly a campaign relating to road safety in rural areas.

In response, Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, stated that there were clear criteria relating to precautionary gritting and Blindsight Lane did not meet the criteria. Peak Pitts Lane had been reinstated as a route which would be gritted because of changes which reinstated the bus route. Councillor Scott said that he had corresponded with both of the questioners and the Chief Executive had advised that the discussion on the issue of gritting of Blindsight Lane could go no further and that the questioners could go to the Local Government Ombudsman if they were not

satisfied.

#### 5.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Household Waste Recycling Centres

Dave May asked what the Council's view was on the structure of the charitable company running the Household Waste Recycling Centres, Salvaire, where the Chair of the charity is also the chair of the trading subsidiary, Green Co, delivering the service and is also 100% shareholder of a printing and marketing company that charges tens of thousands of pounds in consultancy fees.

Sharon Lowrie stated that she was the former Green Co Finance Director who had challenged this structure and value for money internally at Board meetings. She said that, in a telephone call to Councillor Scott on 30 May, she shared some good news stories about the recycle service, the fact that a living wage settlement had been reached with the workforce and plans to open the recycle centres for longer, all within budget. She said that she had now been sacked and a further 3 colleagues were subsequently sacked or bullied out of their jobs. She asked if the Council believed that this was pure coincidence.

Geoffrey Broomhead (supported by Jim Rodgers) stated that he had worked the Household Waste Recycling Centres for 14 years, he was partially deaf and had learning difficulties. Together with others, he had walked out for 2 hours when another disabled worker was bullied to breaking point by the management team 2 weeks ago. As a consequence, Geoff and these workers had been disciplined for gross misconduct and they were likely to be sacked. He asked the Council's view of the bullying of these workers, who had done no more than to stand up for a disabled and vulnerable colleague.

Andrew Whitehead stated that in the past two years, the former management had developed employment services for some of the most hard to reach young people in the community, some of whom were in work and in attendance at this meeting. He said the workforce were united and committed to delivering a service to the people of Sheffield and keeping funds in the City for the benefit of Sheffield. He commented that the GMB supported that plan, but clearly Veolia and the charity, Salvaire did not. He asked whether the Council [supported the plan] and if it would intervene in the dispute.

Pete Davies stated that since the former management team have been sacked or forced out of their jobs, this has affected pay and health and safety. Wages had been incorrect and COTC cover was below contract specifications. The 3 sites that remained open were being run by (according to Veolia) friends family and volunteers of the new management team and Salvaire Chair. He stated that he had met yesterday with Veolia. Their response had been to train agency staff to break the dispute. He commented that anyone could be working on these public sites and asked did the Council care and, if so, when will it intervene.

Anthony Robshaw stated that the entire workforce have expressed a formal vote of no confidence in the Salvaire Chair. He asked how the dispute could be resolved whilst such a breakdown in this working relationship exists and how this is in the interests of the Council.

Gordon Parkes stated that part of the dispute concerned the lack of investment in welfare facilities at Deepcar and Highgreen. He asked if the dispute was being used as a smokescreen to justify the complete and permanent closure of these two sites.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene stated that it was considered that a charity structure was an appropriate model for the procurement of the Household Waste Recycling Service. He stated that the Chair of the Charity was due to stand down. The perception of the service was very positive and there was nothing wrong in principle in using a charity to which to sub-contract work.

He said that he would not comment on the circumstances of Sharon Lowrie's dismissal, as it would not be fair to her or to others and he did not have the full facts of the case. The Council was not the employer in this case and there were a range of factors that led to a breakdown in director and management relationships. It was the Council's policy to make sure allegations of bullying were investigated and he had tasked the Council's Chief Executive to investigate the allegations of bullying.

The Council had said that it would look at all options and all of the parties in the dispute would need to sit down and discuss matters and analyse the situation. Councillor Scott stated that he wanted a fair resolution to the dispute.

With regards health and safety, Council Officers inspected sites to make sure they complied with safety and contract standards. If there was evidence of a breach, this should be reported immediately to the Council's Waste Management Team.

In the context of cuts to the Council budget, no services could be entirely protected. The dispute was not a "smokescreen" and the Council wanted to resolve it fairly, quickly and amicably.

The matter could only be resolved by all parties understanding the issues, through consultation and looking at long-term solutions to providing a good service, good jobs, especially for vulnerable people and everyone needed to sit down together and discuss the matter as soon as possible.

#### 5.2.5 Public Questions Concerning the Supported Living Service

Alistair Tice asked whether the Council was aware of the consequences of the privatisation of Supported Living Services in Doncaster some 15 months ago which had resulted in pay cuts and diminished conditions of employment for former Doncaster Council staff. He commented that some experienced staff had been forced to leave their employment because of the pay cuts and had been replaced by staff with a lack of training.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living responded that she was aware of the circumstances in Doncaster involving

Care UK. Sheffield now had a Supported Living Provider Framework and 27 organisations had been successful out of 64. 10 organisations had bid for the Supported Living provision in Handsworth out of which 4 had been shortlisted (this did not include Care UK). The process of deciding which of the 4 organisations would provide Supported Living in Handsworth would include residents and their families. There were already independent providers operating services in the City and they provided good services. The Council was robust in the way it monitored services and had a good relationship with service providers.

5.2.6 Public Questions Concerning Adoption of Land, Community Engagement Minutes of Meetings and Community Rooms

Winnie Smith stated that she was from the Arbourthorne Tenants and Residents Association (TARA) and that the Committee of the TARA would like to speak with someone about adopting the island outside of the Jury's Inn on Arundel Gate/Charles Street, including the use of a gardener, so it could be properly maintained and made to look decent.

Secondly, she asked why the community engagement team did not have to take proper minutes of meetings and whether the TARAs could do the same short record without getting deregistered. She said there was no proof of what had been said and what had been agreed.

Thirdly, Winnie Smith asked why the Council was conducting a survey of community rooms and other places and asked if it was another step to 'get rid of' TARAs. She also commented on the heating in the venue used by the TARA.

With regards to the adoption of the Island on Arundel Gate/Charles Street, Councillor Harpham said that, if this was possible it is something which could happen as the Council was interested in getting local groups to look after local spaces.

As regards the minutes of meetings, Councillor Harpham stated that he would speak with the Engagement Team concerning keeping records of meetings.

In relation to community rooms, the Council needed to know the condition of community rooms in the City. He stated that TARAs were invaluable as part of driving the development of a first rate housing service in Sheffield.

Councillor Harpham stated that he would contact Winnie Smith with regard to the other issues which she had raised.

5.2.7 Public Question Concerning Federation for Housing

Ken Turton stated that he had not received a reply to questions concerning a Federation for Housing Recognition. He said that the Council had established posts of liaison officer in 8 areas, to perform tasks which the Federation could do for free. He asked why the Liaison Officers were doing work that the Federation could do and referred to questions which had been raised with the Cabinet Member, which he stated, had not been answered.

Councillor Harry Harpham, Deputy Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, responded to the questions. He stated that Mr Turton had raised questions in September and he had met with him 2 or 3 weeks later at which time he had asked him to leave his details. A letter had been sent to the Chair of the Federation. He stated that he and Councillor Tony Damms had also met with the Federation.

The Council supported the idea of an independent and democratic tenants' federation. Funding had been given for 6 months and the process by which more funding could be obtained had been set out. A federation could not be said to be independent if it was funded entirely by the Council and to be truly independent, the federation must be supported by the City's TARAs and tenants' movements. A democratic structure was needed at the top of the federation and, at the present time, the steering committee was not stable with members of the committee leaving and returning to posts. Therefore, it could not be said to be either democratic or accountable. Neither did the federation have the support of many TARAs.

If the federation met certain criteria, including that it was independent, democratic and transparent, then Councillor Harpham stated that he would support such an organisation, which would be good for the City.

#### 5.2.8 Public Question Concerning Compensation due to Road Works

Neale Barker stated that he was a Director of Barkers Furniture in Hillsborough and expressed concerns at the adverse effect of road works which were taking place in the area. He had sent correspondence relating to the contractor for Sainsbury's that was undertaking the works and pointed to the delays in completing the road works. He asked for advice on how financial compensation could be obtained.

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development replied that there were two sets of works, firstly, the pinch-point scheme nearer to the City Centre, which was a City Council and Passenger Transport Executive scheme and which was ahead of schedule. Secondly, there was the work relating to Sainsbury's. It appeared that the subcontractors for the Sainsbury's related works had caused some delays. The City Council had no power to force Sainsbury's to compensate but would write to local traders to explain what options might be open to traders.

#### 5.2.9 Public Question Concerning Devolution Proposals

Nigel Slack referred to the announcements concerning new powers to northern cities, including Manchester, Sheffield and Leeds. He made reference to an article in The Guardian newspaper concerning the establishment in Manchester of a directed elected Mayor.

Mr Slack asked the following questions:

1. How does the Council think of Manchester jumping ship on the other Northern cities?
2. Do the Council agree with the approach that gives business leaders a chance to vote on these devolution proposals but no vote for the public that will pay for them?
3. With reference to a summit to be held on 4 November in Leeds to debate the issue he asked which experts and business leaders from Sheffield will be attending?
4. Do the two remaining councils involved see the trap that Manchester is being led into?
5. Does the Council agree with the potential imposition of a directly elected Mayor that we rejected in 2012?
6. Will the Council accept administering the hateful welfare to work programme?

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, stated that he believed that devolution in some form was beneficial to cities and Sheffield had demonstrated that it could implement projects better than central government was able to do and he cited the example of the government led Work Programme, which he said, had failed. Successful projects led by the City included getting people into work, the 100 Apprenticeship Programme and the City Deal programme. There may be opportunities to do further projects as part of wider devolution proposals.

However, he said that devolution should not be something which was imposed but rather it should be discussed and there should be agreement as to which powers were relevant. He agreed that an elected mayor should not be imposed and said that devolved powers should not be tied to the concept of an elected mayor. He did not wish to speak for people in Manchester. Devolution should not be about passporting budget cuts to local areas and a fair approach should be taken. He referred to the disparity between transport spending per head in London and Sheffield. A proper discussion on devolution and devolved powers was required, including the issue of flexibility.

#### 5.2.10 Public Question Concerning the Planning Process

Nigel Slack stated that the planning system was mired in controversy and poor public relations and two particular proposals are causing the bulk of the problems. Whilst he refrained from referring to specific applications, Mr Slack asked the following questions in general terms:

1. When a planning application on the Council's website indicates a determination deadline date, what does that mean?
2. Where a planning guideline indicates a ratio of different usage types within an area, i.e. between A1 and A3 uses, will the recommendation by officers and the decision of the Planning Committee on this aspect of the proposal be based on the current guidelines, guidelines proposed but rejected by the Council on some previous occasion or a developer's feeling as to the likely

future guidelines yet to be tabled or put to a Council decision making process?

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, replied that he did not necessarily agree with the premise of the question relating to poor public relations. Planning should be a proper process and not necessarily about public relations. Consideration must be given to the facts set before an elected body, namely the Planning and Highways Committee which would make decisions in accordance with current guidelines.

Councillor Bramall stated that he would send further detail to Mr Slack by email.

#### 5.2.11 Public Question Concerning the Police and Crime Commissioner By-election

Nigel Slack stated that the Police and Crime Commissioner election was neither a particularly legitimate expression of democracy with less than 15% turnout; and a winner with less than 8% of the electorate voting for them. Nor was it a value for money exercise costing approximately £11.50 per vote cast. He said that, in addition, Doncaster reported that of their electorate only 3.5% voted at the ballot box, the remaining 11.5% being postal votes. He asked the following:

1. What was the ratio of postal to ballot box votes in Sheffield?
2. With 86% of the electorate not voting, no party was in a position to take the moral high ground about who did or did not publicly support voting. The supporters of all parties stayed away from the ballot box and it seems unlikely they listened to any of the politicians pro or anti voting in this particular election. Can the Council please urge all politicians to act more responsibly over such issues?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, replied that she would ask the Returning Officer to provide a response for Mr Slack on the ratio of postal votes to ballot box votes.

She stated that she was not in Sheffield on the day of the Police and Crime Commissioner By-election but said that she had campaigned and had a postal vote. In terms of acting responsibly, Councillor Dore made reference to the Notice of Motion on the Summons for this meeting concerning the proposed extension of voting age to those aged between 16 and 18 years. She emphasised the importance of people exercising their right to vote, especially if they were themselves a politician; and if necessary they should make sure they had a postal vote.

#### 5.2.12 Public Questions Concerning Good Samaritans

Martin Brighton stated that the Metro newspaper had reported that Sheffield has been named as the country's top city for having good Samaritans. He asked what will this Council do to maintain this starring accolade.

In response, Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council stated that Sheffield was the top City for having good Samaritans and there were stories of such acts

on daily basis, a fact which had now been recognised and she said the Council would look at what could be done to maintain this situation.

5.2.13 Public Question Concerning Safeguarding

Martin Brighton stated that six years ago to the day, in this chamber, he raised the issue of the Council's failure to ensure that organised activities for children were supervised by adults who had undergone what were then known as CRB checks. He stated that the explosive reaction of the Council, and the consequential fireworks, are now a matter of public record. Mr Brighton asked what progress has this Council made since then in this regard.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded to the question. She said that she could not remember the occasion to which Mr Brighton referred so she had looked at the minutes of the Council meeting held on 5 November 2008 and found the question from Mr Brighton and the subsequent response from the Leader of the Council at that time, former Councillor Paul Scriven.

Councillor Drayton stated that the Council took accusations very seriously, especially matters relating to safeguarding. The CRB regime had now been replaced by the Disclosure and Barring Service. Eligibility criteria had changed. Regulated activity relating to children included, teaching, training, care, supervision and advice or guidance on wellbeing. Exceptions to regulated activity included family and personal relationships.

A great deal of work had been done in the City regarding the discharge of responsibilities relating to safeguarding and she referred to the work of the Safeguarding Children Board in developing a learning and improvement framework for organisations working with children. Background checks were performed if an individual had unsupervised contact with children, which might include sports activities. Parents were advised to check anyone running activities for children and to ask for evidence of such checks.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that Council had recently considered a Motion concerning safeguarding and protection and it was hoped that the issue would be considered again at the meeting of Council in January 2015.

5.2.14 Public Question Concerning Responses to Questions

Martin Brighton asked if there was any reason why questions put in writing at meetings of the Council cannot be answered appropriately, or written follow-ups processed in keeping with the FoIA (Freedom of Information Act) such that the information sought is provided.

Councillor Julie Dore responded that she believed that the questions which Mr Brighton asked were answered appropriately and, if there was an occasion when she had not done so, she requested Mr Brighton to point it out to her.

5.2.15 Public Question Concerning Complaints

Martin Brighton stated that in this chamber, elected members have heard that some of those who originally made anonymous complaints about him must come forward or be named. He thanked people for their replies. He asked what possible objection could there be to the naming and shaming of the local self-ascribed politicians who have used anonymity on the Internet to insult and otherwise ‘throw proverbial bangers’ and attack him.

Councillor Julie Dore responded with regard to anonymous complaints that whilst she was aware that some people used the internet and social media to insult or abuse others in writing, she did not use the internet or social media herself and she would condemn such misuse of social media. She believed that if someone had something to say then they should stand up and account for what they had said.

5.2.16 Public Question Concerning Member Conduct

Mr Brighton asked if the Council believed, as applied to elected members, albeit euphemistically in these modern times, that those who live by the sword should die by the sword, especially their own, or don heat-resistant gloves and be content with charges of hypocrisy.

Councillor Julie Dore replied that if Mr Brighton believed that she was hypocritical, he should point this out to her.

5.2.17 Public Question Concerning Democratic Process

Mr Brighton stated that the opinion of the Council Leader on the ‘gunpowder and plot’ tactics that pass for local democracy has been duly noted. He asked did this chamber collectively agree with the Council Leader that all democratic processes should be free from secret plots and manipulations.

Councillor Dore stated that with regard to the Gunpowder Plot, she believed that all democratic processes should be free from manipulation.

5.2.18 Public Question Concerning Policy Documents

Mr Brighton asked whether, given the Council Leader’s announcement that all policy documents should be made freely available, can we now expect to see a stellar fountain of documents, or will we again get burnt.

Councillor Dore replied that most of the City Council policy documents were made available on the Council’s website and may have also been subject of consultation and publicity. If Mr Brighton could not find a particular policy document, she suggested that he informs the Council and she said she was sure that access could be obtained to the documents in an appropriate form.

5.2.19 Public Question Concerning the Learning Disability Service

Jane Irvin stated that she was attending the Council meeting to represent her sister who was a resident at the Handsworth residential home and on behalf of other relatives of residents.

She said that her sister had down syndrome and had been diagnosed as being at the severe end of the scale. She had no spoken language and was also physically disabled. She explained that the policy with regard to Supported Living would mean that the people who had effectively been her sister's family and support for 28 years would be no longer. It was felt that the policy was a cost-cutting exercise and she wanted the Council to be aware of the human cost. When her sister woke, she would not know who the people looking after her were. She described the trauma which her sister experienced last time there was such a change. This had caused her to self-harm. Whilst she could not speak, her sister still had feelings. She asked how with the trauma which her sister would undoubtedly suffer as a result of the proposed changes would be dealt with?

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living stated that she did not know the individual circumstances of Jane Irvine's family. However, the community support which we know today did not used to exist for people with learning disabilities and people were often placed in hospital care. Much had changed since that time. It seemed likely that Ms Irvine's sister had also made that journey through the changing care settings and that she had had a difficult time.

There was a transition process as part of the Supported Living model of care and she assured her that her sister would receive the right care and would not simply find that a new carer had been put in place. A decision making process had taken place on 4 November and if there was a change of provider, that provider would know a lot about the people who were resident in the Handsworth home. Care would be taken to make sure things were done in a careful way and that there was dignity in the process of change. Councillor Lea said that she was sure that the carers understood her sister and how to care for her. She stated that individual carers may have changed over time, but that people were able to make the transition. The changes would be carefully monitored at each stage.

### 5.3 Petitions

#### 5.3.1 Petition Requesting Additional Litter/Dog Waste Bins around High Green

The Council received a petition containing 194 signatures requesting additional litter/dog waste bins around High Green.

There was no speaker to the petition. The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene.

#### 5.3.2 Petition Opposing the Potential Privatisation of the Disability Learning Service

The Council received an electronic petition containing 18 signatures opposing the

potential privatisation of the Disability Learning Service.

There was no speaker to the petition. The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living.

#### 5.4 Petition Opposing the Potential Privatisation of the Learning Disability Service

The Council received a petition containing 5,294 signatures opposing the potential privatisation of the Learning Disability Service.

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

The wording of the petition was as follows:-

*"We the undersigned are opposed to the potential privatisation of the learning disability service in Sheffield. This service has been run for nearly 40 years by the health service to a high standard and should not be auctioned off to the lowest tender. We call upon Sheffield City Council to drop proposals to outsource this service and instead work with the health service to maintain these high standards of care and further improve upon them where possible. If you agree, we would highly appreciate your signature."*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Charlie Carruth. He stated that UNISON had been running a campaign on the issue of the Learning Disability Service for some 9 months and had attempted to be fair and amicable. However, he stated that some of the statements which had been made were not borne out by the information that was being provided to people. He said there was a choice not to outsource the provision. He said the Health and Social Care Trust had indicated that they would sit down with UNISON and discuss the issue.

He stated that the budget situation was understood. The service users in question were people with learning disabilities or might have mental health or other needs all of whom were vulnerable people and they should not be put in a position where they were unsure as to what was happening and who would care for them in future. He said that the idea that the contract could be changed and at the same time there could be continuity was false. The transfer of provision presently at Handsworth would take place on 5 January 2015 and a satisfactory handover would not be likely as there was a potential liability on the NHS if it helped to provide a reasonable transition.

Council officers had said that the payment of the Living Wage by provider organisations was an aspiration and not policy and it would take some time to implement. He said that this did not reflect the content of the Fairness Commission report relating to the Living Wage.

There would, he said, be casualties arising from the changes and the UNISON campaign related both to people's concerns and to the consultation process. People had been told that this will happen and had, it was felt, been patronised

and had not been listened to. He asked that the process was halted and referred to the relevant Scrutiny Committee of the Council so that a debate could take place about the service users in order that they received respect and obtained the services that they deserved.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living made an initial response to the petitions, followed by the Shadow Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, responded to the petition. She stated that the decision concerning Learning Disability Services was a difficult decision to make. It had been agreed that the proposed model would provide the best possible care and support for people and the changes would improve their lives. The decision to adopt the Supported Living model had actually been taken some time ago and Supported Living was a recognised national model. There were records of the consultation meetings that had been held. The intention was for people to have more choice, control and independence, such as what time to get up or have breakfast and what to wear. People could also claim benefits if they were living independently. In the past, there were not the community care options that were now available and residential care was the primary option. Some changes will have occurred over time as some carers had moved on over time.

Councillor Lea outlined the process by which 64 organisations had applied to be part of the Supported Living Framework and 27 had been successful, including Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust. Quality was the most important factor and taking that into account, the organisations which had been shortlisted would have been shortlisted regardless of cost.

There were independent advocates who would make home visits and work closely with families. The process would be closely monitored and the Council wanted to ensure high quality and cost effective services, supported by a strong ethos and values and good management. There was confidence that the providers who were part of the Framework would be able to deliver and achieve the best outcomes for people with learning disabilities.

Members of the City Council then debated the issues raised by the petition. The points made by Members during the debate are summarised below:

- It was expected that support would be given to people during the transition and Councillors also had a role as scrutineers of change and process. The way that people were cared for had changed considerably over time including from institutional to community settings.
- The deep concern that people had about the effect of changes on people with learning disabilities including a new home and possibly a new carer was recognised. The aim was for people to have personalised services. Many services were delivered by the independent or voluntary sector and these were of equal quality and verified by the Care Quality Commission.

- The question of whether there had been adequate consultation on the decision to contract out services was important. Quality of care was of the utmost importance.
- The UNISON Ethical Care Charter considered the conditions for people working in home care settings and the care they offered to service users. The Charter set out standards for commissioning including those relating to the length of home visits, continuity of care and not using zero hour contracts and payment of the Living Wage.
- We should insist upon high standards of care and service users and their families need to be confident in the ability of providers and that quality of care was paramount. The transition should be carried out in a supported way and any meetings which were part of this process should involve everyone who needed to be heard.
- People should be supported to live a healthy and enriching life. Most of the funding for Learning Disabilities Services related to social care and came from local authority budgets, which had been cut by approximately half over 5 years. The Council therefore had to do the best with the resources that were available and Supported Living was a model of care which was being used to support people with learning disabilities. Parents and family members would be concerned to know who will provide support when they were not there.
- It was recognised that change was difficult for people with learning disabilities, their families and staff. Staff worked in difficult circumstances on relatively low pay and may not feel valued. More funding was needed for social care. The Council wanted people with learning disabilities to develop greater independence and to make sure that services for them were the best they could possibly be with individualised care packages.
- The process of change had begun in 2010 and the Council wanted the outcomes to be the best for all of those involved. The way that people were cared for was now more enlightened but it was appreciated that it was difficult for people to move from an existing to a new system. There were also concerns about the TUPE arrangements, payment of a Living wage and preservation of employee conditions. In the long term, the system should be one which best provided for people with learning disabilities.

Charlie Carruth, the Lead Petitioner, exercised a right of reply to the matters raised in the debate. He stated that whilst some changes were welcome, people wanted the service to be provided by the NHS and not the independent or private sector. He stated that the matter should be discussed and taken before the Council's Scrutiny Committee before it progresses further. Care UK, he said, was a private organisation set up to make money from providing care services.

He stated that 4 providers in the process for the Handsworth contract were

offering support workers £7 per hour and he said that experienced, qualified care staff would not be recruited at such rates of pay. He said that he would like the vote on this debate to be recorded. He asked what would happen if, when service users and their families were consulted, they did not wish to use any of the 4 prospective organisations.

Councillor Mary Lea responded to issues raised during the debate. She acknowledged that this was a difficult and emotive subject. She said that consultation had run from 2010 to 2012, although there had been a period during which it had stopped.

Service users would be reassessed to understand their individual needs and this information would inform the bulk contract. There were many organisations in the independent sector which were now part of the Supported Living Framework.

The service users at the heart of the changes needed all of the relevant information and they would be supported through the independent advocacy service. There were also some rumours and myths which existed and it was most important that people had the correct information. She understood that such change was difficult for people.

The following composite outcome was agreed:-

It was RESOLVED: on the Motion of Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the petition now submitted containing over 5,000 signatures opposing the potential privatisation of the learning disability service in Sheffield be referred for consideration by the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee which is to receive an update on the consultation process at its meeting to be held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014, and the City Council (a) directs that the Scrutiny Committee takes into account Unison's Ethical Care Charter and (b) re-affirms its commitment to paying the Living Wage and not making use of zero-hours contracts, in accordance with the Fairness Commission's principles.

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

- For the Motion (76)
- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Simon Clement-Jones, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross,

Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Chris Weldon, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Tim Rippon, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst and Ray Satur.

Against the Motion (0) - Nil.

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

(Note: Having both declared disclosable pecuniary interests in the above item, Councillors John Campbell and Mick Rooney left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote thereon.)

## **6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **5.1 Urgent Business**

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

### **5.2 Questions**

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

### **5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities**

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

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

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Licensing Committee                                | - | Councillor Joyce Wright to replace Councillor Jenny Armstrong                   |
| Planning and Highways Committee                    | - | Councillor Tony Damms to fill a vacancy   |
| Planning and Highways Committee Substitute Members | - | Councillors Ian Auckland, Vickie Priestley and Diana Stimely to fill vacancies  |
|  |   | Remove Councillor Tony Damms to create a vacancy                                |
| Scrutiny Committee Substitute Members              | - | Councillors Vickie Priestley, Diana Stimely and Andrew Sangar to fill vacancies |
| Corporate Parenting Board                          | - | Councillor Penny Baker to replace Councillor Martin Smith                       |

(b) Representatives be appointed to serve on other bodies as follows:-

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group | - | Councillors Tony Downing and Karen McGowan to fill vacancies |
| Anne Reresby Trust, High Green                | - | Councillor Joyce Wright to replace Councillor Phillip Wood   |

## **8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JAYNE DUNN**

### **Homelessness**

It was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Anne Murphy, that this Council:-

- (a) regrets that after falling sharply for six years, the number of statutory homelessness acceptances across England has risen every year since 2010 and substantially by 34% overall since 2009/10;
- (b) notes that under the previous Government, statutory homeless fell by 70% from 2003/4 to 2009/10;

- (c) opposes the Conservative Party's plans to restrict access to housing benefit for 18-21 year olds and believes that to present homelessness as choice for young people reveals how out of touch they are;
- (d) notes that 40% of homeless young people who approach local authorities and housing providers are forced to do so because their parents are no longer willing to accommodate them;
- (e) agrees with the view of Centrepoin that the Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP's policy to axe housing benefit could "do series harm to young people's futures";
- (f) notes that rough sleeping has increased by around a third since this Government took office in 2010;
- (g) supports Roundabout's plan for a "sleep out" on 6th November 2014 to be held at St Andrew's Church, Psalter Lane, noting that this event will raise both money for this venerable charity and awareness of youth homelessness;
- (h) thanks the organisations in Sheffield that work to prevent, tackle and reduce homelessness in our City; and
- (i) resolves to continue to work with partners and other organisations to help prevent and tackle homelessness in Sheffield.

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) and (b) and the addition of new paragraphs (a) and (b) as follows:-
  - (a) notes that homeless acceptances in England have more than halved, and in Yorkshire & the Humber fallen by two-thirds, since 2003 and that the latest Department for Communities and Local Government figures for 2013/14 show a further fall, despite the downturn in the housing market post 2007;
  - (b) recognises that the key to housing solutions to tackle homelessness in the longer term lies in the provision of an adequate supply of affordable homes;
2. the deletion of paragraph (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows:-
  - (f) notes that rough sleeping has increased markedly since the introduction of new counting methodology in 2010, prior to which only 76 out of 354 councils contributed to the total count for England;

3. the re-lettering of paragraphs (g) to (i) as new paragraphs (i) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (g) and (h) as follows:-
- (g) welcomes the provisional Homelessness Prevention Grant allocation of £517,066 to Sheffield City Council for 2013/14 and 2014/15;
  - (h) welcomes the cross-ministerial working group set up in 2011 by the Coalition Government, which has since led to:
    - (i) expansion of the “No Second Night Out” initiative to prevent rough sleeping, of which this Council is subscribed to;
    - (ii) changes in the Localism Act 2011 to give greater freedoms and flexibilities to local authorities to meet the housing needs of homeless families, reducing the need for long waits in temporary accommodation;
    - (iii) the Government-funded Streetlink website alerting local authorities in England about rough sleepers in their area; and
    - (iv) the £20 million Homelessness Transition Fund which has seen a total of £288,905 awarded to local charities Roundabout, ASSIST and the Cathedral Archer Project;

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

After a Right of Reply by Councillor Jayne Dunn, the original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that after falling sharply for six years, the number of statutory homelessness acceptances across England has risen every year since 2010 and substantially by 34% overall since 2009/10;
- (b) notes that under the previous Government, statutory homeless fell by 70% from 2003/4 to 2009/10;
- (c) opposes the Conservative Party’s plans to restrict access to housing benefit for 18-21 year olds and believes that to present homelessness as choice for young people reveals how out of touch they are;
- (d) notes that 40% of homeless young people who approach local authorities and housing providers are forced to do so because their parents are no longer willing to accommodate them;
- (e) agrees with the view of Centrepoin that the Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP’s policy to axe housing benefit could “do series harm to young people’s futures”;

- (f) notes that rough sleeping has increased by around a third since this Government took office in 2010;
- (g) supports Roundabout's plan for a "sleep out" on 6th November 2014 to be held at St Andrew's Church, Psalter Lane, noting that this event will raise both money for this venerable charity and awareness of youth homelessness;
- (h) thanks the organisations in Sheffield that work to prevent, tackle and reduce homelessness in our City; and
- (i) resolves to continue to work with partners and other organisations to help prevent and tackle homelessness in Sheffield.

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

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

### **Government's Support to People with Disabilities**

It was moved by Councillor Robert Johnson, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council:-

- (a) condemns the comments of Conservative Welfare Minister, Lord Freud, that people with disabilities are "not worth the minimum wage";
- (b) condemns the Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP's failure to sack Lord Freud, which shows his complete lack of leadership and unwillingness to protect the vulnerable in our society;
- (c) believes that Lord Freud's actions are worse than his words, such as the closure of the Independent Living Fund, a lifeline for 18,000 people with disabilities;
- (d) believes the Government have failed disabled people, as shown in a report by the Centre for Welfare Reform which states that austerity and cuts are hitting disabled people nine times harder than other groups;
- (e) welcomes the Labour Party's promise to abolish the "Bedroom Tax", a policy which is a further example of this Government's attack on people with disabilities; and

- (f) calls for the resignation of Lord Freud.

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

- (b) notes that guidance from the Labour Government in 2003 analysed scenarios in which it may be possible to make payments below the minimum wage for work-like activity that may be considered beneficial to a disabled person;
- (c) notes that Lord Freud was also an adviser to former Prime Minister Tony Blair; and
- (d) believes all workers should be paid at least the minimum wage without exception.

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) condemns the comments of Conservative Welfare Minister, Lord Freud, that people with disabilities are “not worth the minimum wage”;
- (b) condemns the Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP’s failure to sack Lord Freud, which shows his complete lack of leadership and unwillingness to protect the vulnerable in our society;
- (c) believes that Lord Freud’s actions are worse than his words, such as the closure of the Independent Living Fund, a lifeline for 18,000 people with disabilities;
- (d) believes the Government have failed disabled people, as shown in a report by the Centre for Welfare Reform which states that austerity and cuts are hitting disabled people nine times harder than other groups;
- (e) welcomes the Labour Party’s promise to abolish the “Bedroom Tax”, a policy which is a further example of this Government’s attack on people with disabilities; and
- (f) calls for the resignation of Lord Freud.

(Notes: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraph (a) and

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

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

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

### **Tenant Evictions by Private Landlords**

It was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that privately-rented housing in Sheffield has more than doubled in size since 2001, with some 35,670 Sheffield households now living in private-rented housing, and that nine million people now live in rented housing in England;
- (b) notes with concern that in England some landlords use legitimate possession powers to evict their tenants for speaking up about bad conditions;
- (c) is alarmed that Shelter estimates that 200,000 tenants have been evicted in these circumstances in the past year;
- (d) is dismayed that Shelter's research suggests that one in twelve private tenants have avoided asking for repairs in case they are evicted;
- (e) believes that the law needs to be changed to end such evictions, and to give renters back the confidence they need to ask for basic repairs;
- (f) welcomes the Tenancies (Reform) Bill, presented by Liberal Democrat MP, Sarah Teather, which will, if enacted, change the law to stop landlords issuing an eviction notice when the tenant has made a legitimate complaint about conditions;
- (g) notes that the bill will have its second reading on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014;
- (h) therefore expresses its support for the Bill; and
- (i) instructs that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield MPs.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Tony Damms, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the insertion of a new paragraph (b) as follows, and the re-lettering of all subsequent paragraphs accordingly:-
  - (b) condemns the appalling record of the present Government on

housing, particularly with regards to social housing, and notes the article in last week's Independent newspaper entitled 'Great council house sell-off scandal: Right-to-buy council houses leave nowhere for poor to live' which stated that "the Government's new initiative to encourage councils to sell their houses is having a disastrous effect."

2. the insertion after the words "Sarah Teather" in original paragraph (f) of the words "and supported by Labour MP, the Rt. Hon. John Healey,"; and
3. the insertion of a new paragraph (j) as follows, and the re-lettering of the new paragraph (j) as a new paragraph (k):-
  - (j) welcomes the actions of the present Administration on private sector housing standards, particularly the Selective Licensing Scheme;

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

(Note: 1. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs 2 and 3 of the amendment and abstained on paragraph 1, sub- paragraph (b) and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker voted for paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (j) and voted against paragraphs 1 and 2 of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) notes that privately-rented housing in Sheffield has more than doubled in size since 2001, with some 35,670 Sheffield households now living in private-rented housing, and that nine million people now live in rented housing in England;
- (b) condemns the appalling record of the present Government on housing, particularly with regards to social housing, and notes the article in last week's Independent newspaper entitled 'Great council house sell-off scandal: Right-to-buy council houses leave nowhere for poor to live' which stated that "the Government's new initiative to encourage councils to sell their houses is having a disastrous effect";
- (c) notes with concern that in England some landlords use legitimate possession powers to evict their tenants for speaking up about bad conditions;
- (d) is alarmed that Shelter estimates that 200,000 tenants have been evicted in these circumstances in the past year;
- (e) is dismayed that Shelter's research suggests that one in twelve private

- tenants have avoided asking for repairs in case they are evicted;
- (f) believes that the law needs to be changed to end such evictions, and to give renters back the confidence they need to ask for basic repairs;
  - (g) welcomes the Tenancies (Reform) Bill, presented by Liberal Democrat MP, Sarah Teather and supported by Labour MP, the Rt. Hon. John Healey which will, if enacted, change the law to stop landlords issuing an eviction notice when the tenant has made a legitimate complaint about conditions;
  - (h) notes that the bill will have its second reading on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014;
  - (i) therefore expresses its support for the Bill;
  - (j) welcomes the actions of the present Administration on private sector housing standards, particularly the Selective Licensing Scheme; and
  - (k) instructs that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield MPs.

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

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

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

### **Voting Age**

It was moved by Councillor Geoff Smith, seconded by Councillor Mike Drabble, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the successful participation of 16-17 year olds in the referendum on Scottish Independence, in which over 109,000 16-17 year olds registered to vote;
- (b) notes that currently 16 and 17 year olds are eligible for service in our armed forces, eligible for tax credits and welfare, and eligible to pay income tax and national insurance, yet are barred from electing their representatives;
- (c) notes that 16 year olds are already able to vote in the Isle of Man, Jersey and Guernsey, as well vote at many levels of government in other countries

such as Austria, Germany and Norway;

- (d) notes that a survey by the Electoral Commission found 74% of respondents to be in favour of lowering the age at which the franchise is awarded at age 16;
- (e) believes that votes at 16 will make politics more democratically accountable and will empower a voiceless section of our society;
- (f) welcomes the decision of the Sheffield Youth Cabinet to make Votes at 16 in UK parliamentary and local elections a priority for 2015;
- (g) welcomes the Labour Party's pledge to include votes at 16 in its 2015 manifesto; and
- (h) directs that a copy of this Motion be forwarded to the Sheffield Youth Cabinet, Sheffield Youth Council and Sheffield Members of the Youth Parliament.

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 insertion after the word "welcomes" in paragraph (g) of the words "the longstanding Liberal Democrat commitment to".

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

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the successful participation of 16-17 year olds in the referendum on Scottish Independence, in which over 109,000 16-17 year olds registered to vote;
- (b) notes that currently 16 and 17 year olds are eligible for service in our armed forces, eligible for tax credits and welfare, and eligible to pay income tax and national insurance, yet are barred from electing their representatives;
- (c) notes that 16 year olds are already able to vote in the Isle of Man, Jersey and Guernsey, as well vote at many levels of government in other countries such as Austria, Germany and Norway;
- (d) notes that a survey by the Electoral Commission found 74% of respondents to be in favour of lowering the age at which the franchise is awarded at age 16;
- (e) believes that votes at 16 will make politics more democratically accountable and will empower a voiceless section of our society;

- (f) welcomes the decision of the Sheffield Youth Cabinet to make Votes at 16 in UK parliamentary and local elections a priority for 2015;
- (g) welcomes the Labour Party's pledge to include votes at 16 in its 2015 manifesto; and
- (h) directs that a copy of this Motion be forwarded to the Sheffield Youth Cabinet, Sheffield Youth Council and Sheffield Members of the Youth Parliament.

## **12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NIKKI BOND**

### **Violence Against Women**

It was moved by Councillor Nikki Bond, seconded by Councillor Nasima Akther, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the campaign of the United Nations Secretary General to UNiTE to End Violence Against Women on the 25th of each month;
- (b) further welcomes that 25th November is the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women and also marks the start of 16 days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence;
- (c) believes an International Day to End Violence Against Women is important because:
  - (i) violence against women is a human rights violation;
  - (ii) violence against women is a consequence of discrimination against women, in law and also in practice, and of persisting inequalities between men and women;
  - (iii) violence against women impacts on, and impedes, progress in many areas, including poverty eradication, combating HIV/AIDS, and peace and security;
  - (iv) violence against women and girls is not inevitable; prevention is possible and essential; and
  - (v) violence against women continues to be a global pandemic; up to 70 per cent of women experience violence in their lifetime;
- (d) supports the efforts of One Billion Rising – Sheffield, to raise awareness of violence against women and support them with their plans for a flash mob in the Peace Gardens on 14th February 2015;
- (e) welcomes the decision of the Labour Party to appoint a Shadow Minister

for Violence against Women and Girls and a commitment to include a Violence against Women and Girls Bill with national standards for tackling the issue in the first Queen's speech if they are elected to Government in 2015;

- (f) thanks the efforts of Sexual Health Sheffield in their community engagement work in educating young people on issues of consent and healthy relationships, which no doubt link to violence against women and girls and recognises that Sheffield is the only city with a Sexual Health Champion;
- (g) urges everyone to take responsibility for tackling violence against women and girls; and
- (h) calls on all Councillors to sign the petition by the European Women's Lobby calling on the future European Commission President to establish 2016 as the European year to end violence against women and girls.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the re-lettering of paragraphs (f) to (h) as new paragraphs (g) to (i) and the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows:-

- (f) welcomes Liberal Democrat Minister, the Rt. Hon. Lynne Featherstone MP's work opposing female genital mutilation (FGM), including measures to identify and prevent FGM in the UK and the securing of a £35m programme expected to reduce FGM by 30% in at least 10 priority countries within 5 years.

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) welcomes the campaign of the United Nations Secretary General to UNiTE to End Violence Against Women on the 25th of each month;
- (b) further welcomes that 25th November is the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women and also marks the start of 16 days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence;
- (c) believes an International Day to End Violence Against Women is important because:
  - (i) violence against women is a human rights violation;
  - (ii) violence against women is a consequence of discrimination against women, in law and also in practice, and of persisting inequalities

- between men and women;
- (iii) violence against women impacts on, and impedes, progress in many areas, including poverty eradication, combating HIV/AIDS, and peace and security;
  - (iv) violence against women and girls is not inevitable; prevention is possible and essential; and
  - (v) violence against women continues to be a global pandemic; up to 70 per cent of women experience violence in their lifetime;
- (d) supports the efforts of One Billion Rising – Sheffield, to raise awareness of violence against women and support them with their plans for a flash mob in the Peace Gardens on 14th February 2015;
  - (e) welcomes the decision of the Labour Party to appoint a Shadow Minister for Violence against Women and Girls and a commitment to include a Violence against Women and Girls Bill with national standards for tackling the issue in the first Queen's speech if they are elected to Government in 2015;
  - (f) welcomes Liberal Democrat Minister, the Rt. Hon. Lynne Featherstone MP's work opposing female genital mutilation (FGM), including measures to identify and prevent FGM in the UK and the securing of a £35m programme expected to reduce FGM by 30% in at least 10 priority countries within 5 years;
  - (g) thanks the efforts of Sexual Health Sheffield in their community engagement work in educating young people on issues of consent and healthy relationships, which no doubt link to violence against women and girls and recognises that Sheffield is the only city with a Sexual Health Champion;
  - (h) urges everyone to take responsibility for tackling violence against women and girls; and
  - (i) calls on all Councillors to sign the petition by the European Women's Lobby calling on the future European Commission President to establish 2016 as the European year to end violence against women and girls.

**13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND**

**Free Car Parking During the Christmas Trading Period**

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) recognises the vital importance to local retail business in the City Centre and District Shopping Centres, of the Christmas Trading period;
- (b) notes nearby competing shopping centres such as Rotherham and Chesterfield are offering free car parking incentives in the run up to Christmas;
- (c) therefore calls on the Administration to offer free Christmas Parking incentives applicable to the City Centre and district centres, during the forthcoming Festive Season; and
- (d) believes that this can be financed this year by using savings made during the recent industrial action.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) and (d) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-

- (c) therefore welcomes the article in last week's Star newspaper, 'Sheffield will have free parking in festive countdown' and looks forward to the details of the scheme being announced shortly.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, as a further amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
  - (c) welcomes the reported announcement by the Administration that car parking incentives will be offered in the run up to Christmas, but believes that dither and delay once more points to their "anti-car" attitude;
2. the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-
  - (e) notes that there are only 49 shopping days to Christmas!

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

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) recognises the vital importance to local retail business in the City Centre and District Shopping Centres, of the Christmas Trading period;

- (b) notes nearby competing shopping centres such as Rotherham and Chesterfield are offering free car parking incentives in the run up to Christmas; and
- (c) therefore welcomes the article in last week's Star newspaper, 'Sheffield will have free parking in festive countdown' and looks forward to the details of the scheme being announced shortly.

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

#### **14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SARAH JANE SMALLEY**

##### **City Centre Economy**

It was moved by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, seconded by Councillor Jillian Creasy, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the ongoing public debate about the future of the city centre which is important to the people who live and work in it as well as visitors from the rest of Sheffield, the city region and beyond;
- (b) recognises the calls for:-
  - (i) a greater focus on micro and small independent businesses;
  - (ii) more residential development which caters for a wider mix of households;
  - (iii) more green spaces;
  - (iv) a more coordinated approach to balancing the night time entertainment with the need to sleep; and
  - (v) ongoing support for the vulnerable people who gravitate to the city centre;
- (c) notes that the Cultural Industries and Devonshire Quarter Action Plans set out just such a vision and specifically sought to protect and promote the businesses and communities which created them;
- (d) notes that elements of these plans have been carried through into the 2010 draft City Policies and Sites and 2013 draft City Centre Masterplan, both of which have been approved by Cabinet;
- (e) therefore welcomes recent initiatives which foster these aims, for instance:

- (i) the support by the Council and Sheffield University for “meanwhile” use of buildings in the city centre;
  - (ii) the Star newspaper’s call for an overhaul of the business rates system which is crippling small traders;
  - (iii) the Inside-Out festival on 25th October 2014 organised by Sheffield City Centre Residents Action Group to celebrate community in the city centre;
  - (iv) the proposed development and application for funding for a wildflower meadow at Love Square on West Bar; and
  - (v) the efforts to improve joint working between Planning, Licensing and the public to ease issues around late night opening and alcohol related problems, including the Central Local Area Partnership public meeting on 4th November 2014; and
- (f) asks officers to reconsider the City Centre vibrancy measures used by Sheffield City Council in order to broaden the definition of vibrancy; currently these measures focus on spend and visitors including footfall in the main shopping streets, visits to the largest galleries and hotel occupancy, and it is suggested that they be broadened to include measures around the variety of businesses, for example measuring size by turnover, “localness” (i.e. registered in city region or outside) and at what times the organisations are open for business.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the insertion of new paragraphs (a) to (c) as follows, and the re-lettering of all subsequent paragraphs accordingly:-
  - (a) believes that Sheffield City Centre lies at the heart of the Sheffield City Region economy and the development of the city centre will play a crucial part in creating more jobs and growth in the city and city region as a whole;
  - (b) acknowledges the importance of creating more jobs in the city centre, particularly noting recent research illustrating that Sheffield only has 33,780 private sector jobs in the city centre, the lowest of the Core Cities and significantly below 96,917 in Manchester, 91,356 in Birmingham and 72,689 in Leeds, and notes research for the Local Enterprise Partnership which suggested that strengthening Sheffield City Centre is essential to improving the overall performance of the city region’s economy;
  - (c) unequivocally supports the case for a city centre HS2 station and believes that this is fundamental to the future of both the city centre,

the city and wider city region's economy and is extremely disappointed with the recent report of HS2 Ltd's Chairman, David Higgins, which continued to back Meadowhall despite the overwhelming evidence in favour of a city centre station;

2. the addition of the words "which was initiated by Labour Councillors" at the end of original sub-paragraph (e)(v); and
3. the addition of the words "whilst ensuring that any changes do not detract from the crucial aim of supporting the development of the city centre economy" at the end of original paragraph (f).

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) believes that Sheffield City Centre lies at the heart of the Sheffield City Region economy and the development of the city centre will play a crucial part in creating more jobs and growth in the city and city region as a whole;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of creating more jobs in the city centre, particularly noting recent research illustrating that Sheffield only has 33,780 private sector jobs in the city centre, the lowest of the Core Cities and significantly below 96,917 in Manchester, 91,356 in Birmingham and 72,689 in Leeds, and notes research for the Local Enterprise Partnership which suggested that strengthening Sheffield City Centre is essential to improving the overall performance of the city region's economy;
- (c) unequivocally supports the case for a city centre HS2 station and believes that this is fundamental to the future of both the city centre, the city and wider city region's economy and is extremely disappointed with the recent report of HS2 Ltd's Chairman, David Higgins, which continued to back Meadowhall despite the overwhelming evidence in favour of a city centre station;
- (d) welcomes the ongoing public debate about the future of the city centre which is important to the people who live and work in it as well as visitors from the rest of Sheffield, the city region and beyond;
- (e) recognises the calls for:-
  - (i) a greater focus on micro and small independent businesses;
  - (ii) more residential development which caters for a wider mix of households;
  - (iii) more green spaces;

- (iv) a more coordinated approach to balancing the night time entertainment with the need to sleep; and
- (v) ongoing support for the vulnerable people who gravitate to the city centre;
- (f) notes that the Cultural Industries and Devonshire Quarter Action Plans set out just such a vision and specifically sought to protect and promote the businesses and communities which created them;
- (g) notes that elements of these plans have been carried through into the 2010 draft City Policies and Sites and 2013 draft City Centre Masterplan, both of which have been approved by Cabinet;
- (h) therefore welcomes recent initiatives which foster these aims, for instance:
  - (i) the support by the Council and Sheffield University for “meanwhile” use of buildings in the city centre;
  - (ii) the Star newspaper’s call for an overhaul of the business rates system which is crippling small traders;
  - (iii) the Inside-Out festival on 25th October 2014 organised by Sheffield City Centre Residents Action Group to celebrate community in the city centre;
  - (iv) the proposed development and application for funding for a wildflower meadow at Love Square on West Bar; and
  - (v) the efforts to improve joint working between Planning, Licensing and the public to ease issues around late night opening and alcohol related problems, including the Central Local Area Partnership public meeting on 4th November 2014 which was initiated by Labour Councillors; and
- (i) asks officers to reconsider the City Centre vibrancy measures used by Sheffield City Council in order to broaden the definition of vibrancy; currently these measures focus on spend and visitors including footfall in the main shopping streets, visits to the largest galleries and hotel occupancy, and it is suggested that they be broadened to include measures around the variety of businesses, for example measuring size by turnover, “localness” (i.e. registered in city region or outside) and at what times the organisations are open for business whilst ensuring that any changes do not detract from the crucial aim of supporting the development of the city centre economy”.

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

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAULINE ANDREWS**

**Highways Works on Penistone Road**

It was moved by Councillor Pauline Andrews, seconded by Councillor John Booker, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with disappointment that since the start of roadworks taking place in the vicinity of Halifax Road / Leppings Lane, this appears to have had a catastrophic effect to local businesses and residents alike;
- (b) recognises the stress and the loss of business to traders i.e. lack of income, due to no 'right turn' into Leppings Lane, resulting in highway users having to travel towards Owlerton Stadium before enabling them to turn around, and travel back towards Catch Bar Lane;
- (c) believes that there has been a lack of urgency by the Administration to deal with this issue by challenging the contractors appointed by Sainsbury's;
- (d) notes that a visit by a UKIP Councillor to business premises along Leppings Lane has highlighted that there has been an apparent lack of ongoing consultation with business owners / managers, and residents, resulting in a total lack of understanding of the needs of local businesses and residents by the contractors appointed to the scheme;
- (e) notes that what was proposed as a two week closure of Leppings Lane, now appears to have over run its course, resulting in even more hardship for local traders and residents;
- (f) believes that inconsiderate and inconvenient working practices have resulted in local residents suffering sleep deprivation, due to the constant noise throughout the early hours of the morning and evenings, and whilst it is appreciated that this work has to be carried out, more consideration and pre-planning for local people should have been put at the forefront;
- (g) calls on the contractors to compensate traders for loss of business;
- (h) believes it is important that the Council keep local people updated as to how the works are progressing, which would minimize disruption; and
- (i) notes the impact on daily commuters whilst travelling on a main arterial road towards and away from Sheffield, who use this route, who are often delayed for excessive periods of time whilst trying to get to work.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jack Clarkson, seconded by Councillor John Booker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the re-lettering of paragraphs (g) to (i) as new paragraphs (h) to (j) and the addition of a new paragraph (g) as follows:-

- (g) queries whether the Administration considered introducing penalty clauses for delayed completion of the highways works;

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

It was then moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words therefor:-

- (a) supports the improvements that are currently being made on Penistone Road and notes that existing businesses on and around Penistone Road itself often suffer because of local traffic congestion and therefore believes that, in addition to improving journey times along the A61 corridor, the pinch point scheme will help to improve access to local businesses and facilities, thereby encouraging economic growth;
- (b) welcomes that the new Sainsbury's being built off the road in Wadsley Bridge will bring 250 jobs to the city and that Sainsbury's agreed to make changes to Penistone Road as part of the development, including replacing the roundabout at the junction of Penistone Road, Leppings Lane and Herries Road with a traffic light-controlled crossroads;
- (c) believes that these works are important, however, agrees that disruption should be kept to a minimum and is concerned by the reports that the works have taken too long to complete and of the impact this may have had on businesses and commuters using the road;
- (d) regrets that the delays are causing frustration for everyone affected and notes that these have been caused by a subcontractor and they have ignored efforts by Council officers to contact them for an explanation about the delays;
- (e) asks officers to investigate if the businesses who have been impacted qualify for compensation under existing statutory guidelines; and
- (f) resolves to write to the contractor asking them to contact the local businesses who have been impacted by the works, to apologise for the disruption that has been caused and to provide a more complete explanation for the length of time this has taken.

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:-

<b>RESOLVED:</b> That this Council:-
--------------------------------------

- (a) supports the improvements that are currently being made on Penistone Road and notes that existing businesses on and around Penistone Road itself often suffer because of local traffic congestion and therefore believes that, in addition to improving journey times along the A61 corridor, the pinch point scheme will help to improve access to local businesses and facilities, thereby encouraging economic growth;
- (b) welcomes that the new Sainsbury's being built off the road in Wadsley Bridge will bring 250 jobs to the city and that Sainsbury's agreed to make changes to Penistone Road as part of the development, including replacing the roundabout at the junction of Penistone Road, Leppings Lane and Herries Road with a traffic light-controlled crossroads;
- (c) believes that these works are important, however, agrees that disruption should be kept to a minimum and is concerned by the reports that the works have taken too long to complete and of the impact this may have had on businesses and commuters using the road;
- (d) regrets that the delays are causing frustration for everyone affected and notes that these have been caused by a subcontractor and they have ignored efforts by Council officers to contact them for an explanation about the delays;
- (e) asks officers to investigate if the businesses who have been impacted qualify for compensation under existing statutory guidelines; and
- (f) resolves to write to the contractor asking them to contact the local businesses who have been impacted by the works, to apologise for the disruption that has been caused and to provide a more complete explanation for the length of time this has taken.

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

**16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL**

**Northern and TransPennine Rail Routes – Driver Only Trains**

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

- (a) registers its opposition to the Northern and TransPennine Express franchise requirement for driver only trains, and the Government's plans to make driver only trains mandatory;

- (b) supports the RMT (National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers') campaign to protect on-board conductors on the Northern and TransPennine routes and hundreds of essential rail jobs;
- (c) believes that, if implemented, the plan would result in cuts to funding, fare rises, service and timetable cuts and the loss of hundreds of essential rail jobs;
- (d) also believes that in addition to the loss of skilled jobs, passenger service and passenger safety will be worsened by this plan to remove guards and conductors from services and introduce Driver-Only-Operation;
- (e) notes that these proposals come on top of rail fare hikes and the pre-existing understaffing of many stations and the closure of ticket offices, making guards and on-board conductors even more essential to passenger safety;
- (f) believes that protecting and increasing staffing levels are the most effective way of improving security and passenger safety;
- (g) notes that the driver is responsible for safe operation of the train and the on-board conductor for the protection of passengers;
- (h) notes that currently, guards and on-board conductors are fully trained in operational safety, route knowledge, including safely securing doors, protecting the train and acting in emergencies such as driver incapacity;
- (i) believes that these types of cuts to rail services particularly have an impact on disabled, older and women passengers, and go against the wishes of passengers who value proper staffing of trains and stations; and
- (j) urges the Government and Rail North to protect passengers and the communities who rely on these rail services by withdrawing these proposals and instead hold meaningful consultations to deliver properly funded, properly staffed and affordable railways in the North.

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

1. the substitution in paragraph (a) of the word "option" for the word "requirement", and the deletion of the words "and the Government's plans to make driver only trains mandatory" from that paragraph; and
2. the deletion of paragraph (j) and the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-
  - (j) urges the RMT union to negotiate more flexibly with the train operators, especially with regard to ticket sales and revenue protection, in order to put forward a positive case to the Department for Transport and Rail North, for

continued driver and conductor staffing of trains.

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

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) registers its opposition to the Northern and TransPennine Express franchise requirement for driver only trains, and the Government's plans to make driver only trains mandatory;
- (b) supports the RMT (National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers') campaign to protect on-board conductors on the Northern and TransPennine routes and hundreds of essential rail jobs;
- (c) believes that, if implemented, the plan would result in cuts to funding, fare rises, service and timetable cuts and the loss of hundreds of essential rail jobs;
- (d) also believes that in addition to the loss of skilled jobs, passenger service and passenger safety will be worsened by this plan to remove guards and conductors from services and introduce Driver-Only-Operation;
- (e) notes that these proposals come on top of rail fare hikes and the pre-existing understaffing of many stations and the closure of ticket offices, making guards and on-board conductors even more essential to passenger safety;
- (f) believes that protecting and increasing staffing levels are the most effective way of improving security and passenger safety;
- (g) notes that the driver is responsible for safe operation of the train and the on-board conductor for the protection of passengers;
- (h) notes that currently, guards and on-board conductors are fully trained in operational safety, route knowledge, including safely securing doors, protecting the train and acting in emergencies such as driver incapacity;
- (i) believes that these types of cuts to rail services particularly have an impact on disabled, older and women passengers, and go against the wishes of passengers who value proper staffing of trains and stations; and
- (j) urges the Government and Rail North to protect passengers and the communities who rely on these rail services by withdrawing these proposals and instead hold meaningful consultations to deliver properly funded, properly staffed and affordable railways in the North.

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew

Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (b) to (i) and against paragraphs (a) and (j) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR RICHARD SHAW**

**Mental Health Services**

It was moved by Councillor Richard Shaw, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that:-
  - (i) an estimated one in four people will experience a mental health problem in their lives;
  - (ii) there is often a relationship between mental health problems and issues such as housing, employment and family problems; and
  - (iii) when the previous Government introduced waiting times for physical health, mental health conditions were excluded;
- (b) welcomes:-
  - (i) the announcement by the Deputy Prime Minister and MP for Sheffield Hallam, The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg, MP, that treatment for mental health conditions will be brought into line with other NHS services with the introduction of waiting time standards;
  - (ii) the additional investment in psychiatric services in acute hospitals for people admitted via Accident and Emergency Departments to ensure that these patients receive the most appropriate treatment; and
  - (iii) the £7 million investment into mental health services for children and young people;
- (c) believes that:-
  - (i) all Councillors can play a positive role in championing mental health issues on an individual and strategic basis; and
  - (ii) Councillors should use every opportunity to tackle discrimination on grounds of mental health and promote positive mental health in schools, colleges and places of employment.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of sub-paragraph (a)(iii) and paragraph (b);
2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) and (c) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (c) as a new paragraph (d):-
  - (b) welcomes any positive actions taken to improve treatment for mental health, however regrets that yet again the Deputy Prime Minister's record does not match his warm words and reminds the main opposition group of reports in 2012 by leading mental health charities that spending on mental health had fallen under this Government for the first time in a decade;
  - (c) notes that during the Deputy Prime Minister's time in Government there are thousands fewer mental health nurses and hundreds fewer mental health doctors in the NHS, and a recent Health Service Journal survey found 3,640 fewer nurses and 213 fewer doctors working in mental health in April this year compared to staffing levels two years ago.

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

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraph 2 and voted against paragraph 1 of the amendment and asked for his to be recorded.)

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) notes that:-
  - (i) an estimated one in four people will experience a mental health problem in their lives;
  - (ii) there is often a relationship between mental health problems and issues such as housing, employment and family problems; and
- (b) welcomes any positive actions taken to improve treatment for mental health, however regrets that yet again the Deputy Prime Minister's record does not match his warm words and reminds the main opposition group of reports in 2012 by leading mental health charities that spending on mental health had fallen under this Government for the first time in a decade;
- (c) notes that during the Deputy Prime Minister's time in Government there are thousands fewer mental health nurses and hundreds fewer mental health doctors in the NHS, and a recent Health Service Journal survey found 3,640 fewer nurses and 213 fewer doctors working in mental health in April this year compared to staffing levels two years ago; and

- (d) believes that:-
- (i) all Councillors can play a positive role in championing mental health issues on an individual and strategic basis; and
  - (ii) Councillors should use every opportunity to tackle discrimination on grounds of mental health and promote positive mental health in schools, colleges and places of employment.

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

## **18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR CLIFF WOODCRAFT**

### **Talking Buses**

It was moved by Councillor Cliff Woodcraft, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the campaign by the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association to install equipment to provide audio announcements of bus stops on buses; so called "Talking Buses";
- (b) notes that in surveys, drivers too often forget to inform blind bus users when they reach their destination, and that this has sometimes had serious repercussions for the passenger;
- (c) notes that some parts of the country already have talking buses, notably London, of which 100% are talking, but also Nottinghamshire, Reading, Coventry, Birmingham and others;
- (d) welcomes the competition launched by Liberal Democrat Transport Minister, Baroness Kramer, to invite students to devise more cost effective ways of providing such equipment;
- (e) agrees that this facility will not only benefit the blind, but improve the travelling experience for all bus users, and that this will encourage use of buses over cars, with associated environmental impact; and
- (f) therefore calls on the Chief Executive to write to South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, First Bus Company and Stagecoach encouraging them to implement talking buses as soon as practicable.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be

amended by the deletion of paragraph (d) and the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-

- (d) welcomes that the campaign run by The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association to equip all new buses with audio visual announcements has been supported cross party and welcomes any attempts by students or other groups to improve the equipment needed to facilitate this development.

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) welcomes the campaign by the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association to install equipment to provide audio announcements of bus stops on buses; so called "Talking Buses";
- (b) notes that in surveys, drivers too often forget to inform blind bus users when they reach their destination, and that this has sometimes had serious repercussions for the passenger;
- (c) notes that some parts of the country already have talking buses, notably London, of which 100% are talking, but also Nottinghamshire, Reading, Coventry, Birmingham and others;
- (d) welcomes that the campaign run by The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association to equip all new buses with audio visual announcements has been supported cross party and welcomes any attempts by students or other groups to improve the equipment needed to facilitate this development;
- (e) agrees that this facility will not only benefit the blind, but improve the travelling experience for all bus users, and that this will encourage use of buses over cars, with associated environmental impact; and
- (f) therefore calls on the Chief Executive to write to South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, First Bus Company and Stagecoach encouraging them to implement talking buses as soon as practicable.

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

### **National Health Service**

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

- (a) notes the continuing problems within the National Health Service that affects all those who work and who are treated within it;
- (b) recognises that GP's have had a pay increase of 40%, and have been released from their out of hours contracts, while the rank and file staff within the service are expected to work harder and harder without a pay increase;
- (c) regrets that midwives and nurses are striking for a miserly 1% pay increase, recommended by the independent pay body, which the Coalition Government is refusing to pay;
- (d) further notes that people can wait for up to ten days to see a GP, waiting times for physiotherapy can take up to three months, operations are cancelled on a regular basis, there is low morale across the NHS, plus a deficit of £30 Billion;
- (e) is saddened by a weekly influx of over 5000 people into this country, which puts immense pressure on this service, and believes that however bad it is today, it will be worse tomorrow;
- (f) realises money in this Country is very tight, yet the European Union demands an extra £1.7 billion from the UK tax payers to be paid by December 2014;
- (g) is staggered to note that the Labour Party sides with the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats, to start once again hostilities in the Middle East, depriving much needed monies that could indeed go towards the easing of problems in the NHS;
- (h) wishes for once in this Country we could try 'welfare not warfare'; and
- (i) confirms its belief that the NHS should always be free at the point of admission, and regrets the campaign of disinformation emanating from the media and main political parties.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Harry Harpham, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (i) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (g) as follows:-

- (b) believes that under this Government, the NHS is going backwards, as one in four people don't get to see a GP within a week and over three million people are on the waiting list for treatment;
- (c) supports the policy of the Shadow Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Andy Burnham MP, to raise £2.5bn for an NHS Time to Care Fund by ensuring that tax avoiders play by the rules, and asking those at the top to pay more;

- (d) welcomes that this money will be used to ensure the NHS is fit for the 21st Century and will deliver 20,000 more nurses, 3,000 more midwives, 8,000 more GPs and 5,000 extra home care workers by the end of the next Parliament;
- (e) believes it was wrong for the Government to single out NHS staff by refusing to implement the 1% pay increase which was recommended by an Independent Body and is being awarded by the Government to other public sector workers;
- (f) regrets that this Government wasted £3 billion on the unwanted and unnecessary top down reorganisation of the NHS; and
- (g) fully supports the NHS and therefore completely opposes the comments by UKIP's Deputy Leader, Paul Nuttall MEP, posted on his website, "I would like to congratulate the Coalition Government for bringing a whiff of privatisation into the beleaguered National Health Service".

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

(Notes: 1. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs (b), (e) and (f) and abstained on paragraphs (c), (d) and (g) of the above Amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker voted for paragraphs (b) to (f) and against paragraph (g) of the above Amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, as an amendment that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words therefor:-

- (a) believes that the NHS should remain free at the point of use;
- (b) recognises the dedication and hard work of staff within the NHS;
- (c) notes that in many parts of the country, the NHS relies on highly skilled and qualified health care professionals recruited from overseas;
- (d) recalls with alarm the words of UKIP's Deputy Leader, Paul Nuttall MEP, "the very existence of the NHS stifles competition....as long as the NHS is the "sacred cow" of British politics, the longer the British people will suffer with a second rate health service"; and
- (e) welcomes the pre-manifesto commitment made by the Liberal Democrats of "Guaranteeing the NHS budget will rise by at least inflation".

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

(Notes: 1. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and abstained on paragraphs (d) and (e) of the above Amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a) to (d) and against paragraph (e) of the above Amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) notes the continuing problems within the National Health Service that affects all those who work and who are treated within it;
- (b) believes that under this Government, the NHS is going backwards, as one in four people don't get to see a GP within a week and over three million people are on the waiting list for treatment;
- (c) supports the policy of the Shadow Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Andy Burnham MP, to raise £2.5bn for an NHS Time to Care Fund by ensuring that tax avoiders play by the rules, and asking those at the top to pay more;
- (d) welcomes that this money will be used to ensure the NHS is fit for the 21st Century and will deliver 20,000 more nurses, 3,000 more midwives, 8,000 more GPs and 5,000 extra home care workers by the end of the next Parliament;
- (e) believes it was wrong for the Government to single out NHS staff by refusing to implement the 1% pay increase which was recommended by an Independent Body and is being awarded by the Government to other public sector workers;
- (f) regrets that this Government wasted £3 billion on the unwanted and unnecessary top down reorganisation of the NHS; and
- (g) fully supports the NHS and therefore completely opposes the comments by UKIP's Deputy Leader, Paul Nuttall MEP, posted on his website, "I would like to congratulate the Coalition Government for bringing a whiff of privatisation into the beleaguered National Health Service".

(Note: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) and (g) and abstained on paragraphs (b) to (f) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

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

3. Having both declared a disclosable pecuniary interest, Councillors Sue Alston and Andrew Sangar took no part in the discussion or vote on the above item.

This page is intentionally left blank