

Agenda Item 3

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield S1 2HH, on Wednesday 3 July 2013, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Vickie Priestley)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Peter Rippon)

1	<i>Arbournthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore John Robson Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Clive Skelton	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Garry Weatherall Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nikki Bond Anders Hanson 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 Martin Lawton Lynn Rooney
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Shaffaq Mohammed Stuart Wattam	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> Mohammad Maroof Robert Murphy	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Bob McCann Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stockbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Janet Bragg Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond	26	<i>Walkey Ward</i> Ben Curran Neale Gibson Nikki Sharpe
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Jenny Armstrong Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> Trevor Bagshaw Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sylvia Anginotti, Alison Brelsford, Jillian Creasy, Harry Harpham and Keith Hill.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Diana Stimely declared a personal interest in item number 14 on the Council Summons (Notice of Motion concerning Sheffield Castle) as a member of the Friends of Sheffield Castle Committee.

Councillor Terry Fox declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item number 11 on the Council Summons (Notice of Motion concerning energy) because of his employment by NACODS, the National Association of Colliery Overmen, Deputies and Shotfirers.

Councillor Denise Fox declared a personal interest in item number 11 on the Council Summons (Notice of Motion concerning energy) on the grounds of her spouse's employment.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 5 June 2013 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Communications

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) made a statement concerning the Council's policy on the recording of its meetings, as follows:

"I wish to make a statement with regard to the Council's policy on the recording of its meetings, as this matter has been the subject of publicity over recent weeks following the issuing of guidance by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. The Council's policy does permit the use of television cameras and recording equipment at the discretion of the Chair of the meeting, and this shall generally be permitted provided adequate notice has been given and convenient arrangements can be made. No request for permission to record has been made for this meeting. However, in the event that the public gallery is full, the proceedings of the meeting will be transmitted in audio format to the overspill area in the Reception Rooms to enable members of the public to hear the proceedings."

The Council noted the statement and that a meeting of the Corporate Members' Group would consider the matter further at its next meeting.

4.2 Petitions

(a) Petition Opposing the Closure of The Meadows Nursery and Children's Centre

The Council received a petition, containing 406 signatures, opposing the proposed closure of The Meadows Nursery and Children's Centre.

On behalf of the petitioners, Lisa Stringfellow addressed the Council. She stated she was distressed to find that Meadows Nursery was closing. Her son had suspected autism and that it would be difficult to find another placement. She said that funding should be found to enable the nursery to continue. It was felt that the affected parents had been informed at the last moment. She suggested that Water Meadows School take on the management of the nursery.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton thanked the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council. She said that she was sorry that the circumstances were upsetting and that the questioner had only found out at short notice about a place which they thought was available to her son.

Action for Children felt unable to continue to run childcare at Meadows Nursery. The Council had been working with Water Meadows School to see whether it would be able to provide provision for 2 year olds. The School had decided that they would not be able to provide such a service. The Council was doing everything it could to make sure every child has a nursery place somewhere, although it was not able to promise a place at Meadows Nursery. The Council had to find a large amount of savings in early year's provision as the Government had reduced the funding available. Services for the most vulnerable had been protected. However, it was not possible to provide funding for all childcare. The Council would continue to ensure places for early learning for children.

(b) Petition Regarding the HGV Ban on Bocking Lane

The Council received a petition containing 16 signatures regarding the consultation process relating to the proposed alterations to the HGV (Heavy Goods Vehicle) ban on Bocking Lane.

On behalf of the petitioners, Ken Newton addressed the Council. He stated that residents had been given 8 days' notice in which to prepare a case concerning the alteration of the restrictions to HGV vehicles on Bocking Lane and he felt, therefore that people had received unfair treatment from the Council's Cabinet Highways Committee. He was advised that the Committee decision could be called in through the scrutiny process, although local Councillors had not been able to meet the deadline to request such a call-in. Bocking Lane was a Class C road and 20,000 vehicles had been recorded in a 12 hour period. In relation to the restriction on HGVs, he asked if the Council would evaluate the operation of enforcement in two years' time. He stated that he believed that the vast majority of residents were against the lifting of the restrictions on HGV's.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. He stated that an indicative decision had been made 8 months' ago and the relevant Traffic Regulation Order had also been made a considerable time before the 8 days to which the petitioners referred.

The issue had received scrutiny over a number of years and the matter had not been referred to the relevant scrutiny committee by the call-in process. Councillor Bramall stated that he understood that the petitioners might not be happy about the decision and acknowledged that it was a difficult decision for the Cabinet Highways Committee to make and one which had to balance different factors. The decision had to be made in the interests of all parties.

(c) Petition Opposing the Closure of Don Valley Stadium

The Council received an electronic petition containing 1049 signatures, opposing the closure of Don Valley Stadium.

On behalf of the petitioners, Christina Wright addressed the Council. She referred to the decision to close the Stadium, which was the third largest athletics stadium in the United Kingdom. In taking away the facilities offered by the Stadium, there would be a reduction in accessibility and inspiration for sport. The Stadium was a unique facility and had grown to become a source of pride and home grown sporting talent. Although the Council needed to save money, it would also lose an opportunity to promote the City as a place for athletes to train. Further use of the facilities would also create income and it would be sad to miss out the opportunities which the Stadium presented.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure. Councillor Bowler stated that she agreed with the petitioner in relation to the special character of the City, which included places that were unusual and unexpected. The Don Valley Stadium was a great resource. However, there was a lack of major events coming to the Stadium, especially music events as event organisers preferred arenas and festivals. Some athletics events were going to other cities with new stadia, for example, London and Glasgow.

Sheffield did continue to attract events at the English Institute of Sport (EIS), Ponds Forge and the Arena, which were all driving activity through the City's venues. As regards training, the EIS provided indoor facilities that were of an international standard. Woodburn Road Stadium would be re-opened with funding from Sport England and with the support of local athletics clubs. The closure of the Don Valley Stadium was in the context of the many significant savings which the Council was required to make and the alternative to closure of the Stadium included closure of several other facilities. She considered that most people would understand the closure of Don Valley Stadium in the context of other alternative savings and the alternative facilities at Woodburn Road.

Don Valley Stadium would also have needed capital expenditure. The Council

was moving to facilities with lower levels of revenue support. £300K was to be invested in Woodburn Road, a facility which would cost £70K per annum to keep open and would be run on the Council's behalf by an athletics club.

(d) Petitions Opposing the Bedroom Tax

The Council received two petitions on the subject of the 'bedroom tax', as follows:

- (i) an electronic and paper petition containing 2194 signatures opposing the bedroom tax.
- (ii) an electronic petition containing 8 signatures opposing the bedroom tax.

In respect of the first petition, and on behalf of the petitioners, Gareth Lane addressed the Council. He stated that he believed the bedroom tax to be a 'wicked and vindictive' tax, which would affect the poorest and most vulnerable members of the community. He said that the austerity agenda was supported by all three of the major political parties. He referred to people having attended court hearings and having felt criminalised and threatened.

It was requested that the Council defend people by refusing to evict people and re-designating bedrooms and that councillors who wished to join the campaign by the benefits justice campaign would be welcome.

There was no speaker to the second petition.

The Council referred the petitions to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore. She thanked the petitioners and said that she understood that this was an emotive issue for people. She explained that Councillor Harry Harpham, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, had given his apologies for this meeting of the Council because he was at the Local Government Association, to attend a meeting concerning funding cuts to local government. Councillor Dore explained that a letter from 150 council leaders had been sent to the Government stating that local government could not sustain further funding cuts.

In relation to the bedroom tax, the Government had written to the Council, stating that it could not redesignate bedrooms and the consequence of such action would be a further reduction in funding. The rules relating to Housing Benefit were set by the Government and people claiming Housing Benefit had been told that, if they lived in a property with a spare bedroom, they could not claim benefit in respect of it. This included cases such as families whose son or daughter was in the armed forces and parents who looked after their children at home part of the time. Councillor Dore stated that the introduction of the bedroom tax would not actually save money and affected many people who were in work but on low incomes.

In reference to the issuing of court summons, Councillor Dore stated that summons had been issued but in respect of Council Tax.

Whilst it was not permitted to re-designate rooms, the Council was finding ways

to make it easier for people who were affected by the changes to welfare. This included access to affordable finance and the use of funding set aside by the Council to support the recommendations of the Fairness Commission. The Council had challenged the Government about the bedroom tax and funding cuts to local government which it was believed were unnecessary. Other councils, including Conservative and Liberal Democrat authorities, were also challenging the cuts. However, the Deputy Prime Minister did not agree with the Council on these matters. Councillor Dore reiterated, this was Government policy.

(e) Petition Regarding the Youth Worker at Woodthorpe Youth Club

The Council received a petition containing 203 signatures and regarding the Youth Worker at Woodthorpe Youth Club.

On behalf of the petitioners, Chris Smedley addressed the Council. She stated that the Woodthorpe Youth Club has closed because there was not a Youth Worker. The worker concerned had been doing the job for many years, but it had been decided now that she was not qualified.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton stated that she was aware that people locally felt strongly about the Youth Worker and Sheffield Futures had good words to say about her and in relation to her contribution to the Youth Club and the local community.

Sheffield Futures was a registered charity and the Council did not have a legal right to appoint or remove workers at Sheffield Futures. Councillor Drayton said that it was her understanding that the worker concerned did not want her personal circumstances brought into the public arena. It was also her understanding that the worker concerned was not removed or sacked, but that there had been a valid recruitment process.

The Club was closed at the present time because of the actions of some people in the community and the Council and Sheffield Futures were to work with young people who use the club to enable a proper programme to be in place and available for young people in the area.

(f) Petition Objecting to the Lack of Car Parking Provision in Batemoor

The Council received a petition containing 196 signatures, objecting to the lack of car parking provision in Batemoor.

On behalf of the petitioners, David Hoad addressed the Council. He stated that currently parking in Batemoor presented a dangerous situation, especially for children and older people and the Tenants and Residents Association had been asked to press for improvements to parking provision. Mr Hoad made reference to a potential solution, in relation to which the Council and its highways provider partner Amey, had been made aware and asked that the Council listen to the wishes of local people regarding the provision of more parking.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall stated that he was not familiar with the scheme to which Mr Hoad referred. He outlined the process previously followed concerning highways schemes which went through the Community Assembly and a related assessment and prioritisation. He added that the funding available through the Local Transport Plan was limited. Councillor Bramall undertook to look at the situation outlined by the petition and to provide a written response to the petition.

(g) Petition Requesting the Use of Land as a Children's Play Area and/or Allotments

The Council received a petition containing 77 signatures and requesting the use of land backing onto 156 Warminster Road as a children's play area and/or allotments.

On behalf of the petitioners, Glyn Hannan addressed the Council. He requested that the community be given permission to develop a piece of land which had been unused for 38 years and which backed onto 156 Warminster Road (Norton Hall residential home). The potential uses for the land included a children's play area and allotments for people in the immediate area. At present, the City Council owned the land. There was concern at the present condition of the land, including the high incidence of dog fouling.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene. Councillor Scott stated that he was aware of the piece of land to which the petition referred and that Council officers were examining options, including the development of allotments, for which there was a high demand in the area. He agreed that the site was an asset and leaving it vacant was not a good use of the land. Councillor Scott confirmed that the Council would continue to work with the local community and the Tenants and Residents Association to develop options for the site.

(h) Petition Regarding the Future of Ecclesall Library

The Council received a petition containing 52 signatures, regarding the future of Ecclesall Library.

On behalf of the petitioners, David Kirkham addressed the Council. He stated that Ecclesall Library was the best used branch library in the City and there was a need for the library service to be provided which was publically funded and with professional staff. He stated that libraries should not be handed over to trusts or cliques as it would remove them from the public interest and any potential failure would be the responsibility of the said trust.

The Council referred the petition to Council Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion.

(i) Petition Opposing the Withdrawal of Funding from Community Libraries

The Council received a petition containing 504 signatures and opposing the proposed withdrawal of funding from community libraries.

On behalf of the petitioners, Chaz Lockett addressed the Council. He referred to the Council savings, which would lead to a cut in funding for 14 of the City's libraries. He stated that the criteria upon which libraries would be judged were not yet known and there was concern about the process for the registration of expressions of interest in supporting the running of libraries.

He said there were reasons why people needed libraries and the knowledge which was available on the internet did not broaden the mind to the same extent as would reading a book. There were an array of events which took place in libraries and libraries were especially relevant to children and young people. One third of households did not have access to the internet and this proportion was seventy per cent for households in social housing. Libraries represented a vital service for internet access and information.

He believed that libraries could not be run by volunteers and that highly trained professional staff were required. He commented that staff in libraries had been told that they should not discuss funding cuts to libraries. He also stated that the Council and other Labour controlled local authorities should stand up for communities, especially those in the north of the Country, to oppose Government funding cuts.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion.

In response to both of the petitions submitted concerning libraries, Councillor Iqbal thanked the petitioners for presenting the petitions to the Council. He commented that he had met Mr Kirkham recently at an Ecclesall Forum event and had also met Mr Lockett. The Council had written to Government Ministers to highlight the unfairness of funding cuts and he also referred to the Fair Deal for Sheffield petition which had received over ten thousand signatures and to the funding cuts to the Council, which were unprecedented.

The Council wished to keep libraries in the City open, but the scale of funding cuts had led it to present a call for action to consider the future sustainability of libraries, working with the voluntary and business sectors and residents. 27 responses were received, 18 of which were from the voluntary sector, 6 from individual organisations, 2 from private organisations and 1 from a parish council.

There were 6,000 responses to consultation during the summer of 2012, which was designed to look at new ways of providing library services. Councillor Iqbal stated that a different model was needed in order to bring about a viable and sustainable library service and a further timetable in relation to the review would be confirmed in due course.

4.3 Public Questions

(a) Public question concerning changes to benefits

Dawn Saunders asked: what was the Council doing about the number of smaller one or two bedroom properties available for people who were facing eviction from larger properties to avoid people being made homeless.

Shirley Frost asked, if the Coalition Government could not be trusted to protect the poor and vulnerable, who will? She referred to hearings in the Magistrates' Court relating to Council Tax and to help she had given to people who were defending themselves against the Summons for Council Tax and she drew attention to people with health conditions, such as those with mental health needs, who were especially affected. She also asked the Council to consider issues including equalities, disability discrimination, its duty of care and the human consequences of changes to benefits. She requested a written answer to her question.

Lesley Boulton asked, in relation to the bedroom tax and Council Tax, was the Council intending to summons people and why were the public denied access to the Court?

Sue Wild asked why the Council was stating that, in relation to the bedroom tax, it would be illegal for it to oppose the Government. She stated that this was also the case in relation to the Poll Tax and people did go to prison at that time. She asked why the Council could not stand up and say that they will not introduce the tax.

Geoffrey Turner asked how does the Council's policy of threats of eviction for some of the most disadvantaged people of Sheffield align with its Labour principles.

Jane Williamson asked how the Council could justify continuing to impose the bedroom tax on vulnerable tenants and stated that if people were evicted as a result, it would be the Council's policy, rather than Government policy.

Paul Page asked, in relation to the non-payment of Council Tax, what made the Council issue summons to people who were already poor, to force them to travel into town, rather than look at each case individually.

Margaret Stone asked what estimates have the Council made of the number of people who are likely to be evicted from their council house due to the bedroom tax and the reduction in Council Tax Benefit and cuts to other benefits. She referred particularly to the effect on children, people with poor mental health and people who are mentally or physically disabled. She asked what does the Council expect to do to help those people.

Rob Lowe referred to the past campaigning in opposition to the Poll Tax and said if people stood up, it could make a difference and that was precisely what the Council's Labour Group should be doing. He stated that the Council should follow the example of Leeds City Council and try to re-classify bedrooms. He stated that the bedroom tax contravened the European Convention on Human Rights and this should be explored and the tax challenged on this basis. He stated that the

only way to stop poverty was to adopt socialism.

In response, Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that she had been part of the campaign relating to opposition to the Poll Tax, like many of her colleagues. The Poll Tax affected everybody and the campaign against it was effective. In contrast, the bedroom tax affected only a comparatively small number of people. The Government was hitting the poorest people and those who were least able to fight back themselves.

The law had changed as well and, if the Council did not set a balanced budget, the Chief Executive would take over and Whitehall would do the work on the Council's behalf relating to the budget.

Councillor Dore stated that the policy of the bedroom tax was a Government decision, which the Council could not overturn. The Council had previously received petitions and representations relating to Don Valley Stadium, libraries, youth work and childcare and there was concern that there would not be enough funding available to protect older and disabled people. The Council was trying to support people through the Social Fund; discretionary housing payments; the Council Tax Support fund; and initiatives funded by money set aside to implement the recommendations of the Fairness Commission, including affordable finance and extension of the credit union to enable access to money. The Council had made 300 opportunities available for young people without level 2 qualifications through the apprenticeship programme and it had introduced a living wage for City Council employees.

The Council had to work with Government Ministers and recently a Minister had come to Sheffield to discuss issues including the Work Programme, which, at the present time was not working effectively; and advice services.

Councillor Dore stated that the Council did oppose the cuts to its funding and pointed out that people's vote did count and they would have an opportunity to vote in the General Election in 2015.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that 35,000 people in the City would be required to pay Council Tax this year for the first time. Reminders had been sent out and Council officers had worked with people who were affected by the changes. A Hardship Fund had been set up and the Council was not pursuing people who had applied for access to the fund and would continue to support people.

The Council needed to collect Council Tax and the Government was not providing a transitional payment this year. All local authorities were in the same position and this was a Government policy decision. The Council had developed a scheme relating to Council Tax which looked forward. 6,000 people faced summons and on the day of their hearing, some people spoke with Council officers to resolve the matter. The issues concerning public access to the Magistrates' Court were a matter for the Court, although Councillor Lodge stated that he was enquiring with the Court in relation to the issue.

(b) Public questions concerning blacklisting by construction companies

Peter Davies asked if the Council agreed that companies such as Chrillion should have no part to play in public sector contracts when they are clearly guilty of blacklisting.

Simon Ray asked what guarantee the Council could give that it will not associate with blacklisting companies.

Mark Hudson asked if the Council would make a public statement regarding blacklisting.

Peter Shaw referred to a blacklisted construction worker who had to seek employment outside of the country as an electrical engineer. He stated that Kier had also blacklisted people in the United Kingdom. He also stated that Unite was campaigning against the practice of blacklisting, which affects people's lives and should be put to an end.

In response, Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that there was a Notice of Motion on the Council agenda relating to blacklisting. She said that the Council did not wish to be associated with blacklisting and that it was an unlawful practice. She confirmed that the Council did not wish to participate with contractors that practice anything which was unlawful. Councillor Dore stated that the Council had asked the Government to intervene in relation to blacklisting and had also written to local contractors. She also referred to a tripartite meeting, including the Council, contractors and trade unions, to ascertain that contractors did not carry out blacklisting. She called upon the Government to follow the Council's example on this issue.

(c) Public question concerning Libraries

Bridget Culbert asked when communities will found out about the expressions of interest in relation to the future of libraries given that this will affect the provision of the service and whether this issue should have been subject to full discussion earlier.

In response, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, stated that there had been 27 responses in all to the invitation for expressions of interest in relation to the future of libraries. However, there was some sensitivity in relation to the negotiations that were taking place and further information could not be made available at this time. When further details were published, the list of the 27 organisations or individuals would be included within it.

(d) Public question concerning Remploy and Sharrow Industries

James Stribley asked whether the Council would agree that procurement tenders should include a paragraph stating that "bids should consider the Council's commitment to assisting Remploy and Sharrow Industries vulnerable workers"

He stated that this would assist workers in finding worthwhile paid employment. Bidders should evidence how they could assist the Council in this goal of securing employment and support for vulnerable workers.

In response, Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that the Council was looking at this issue and he agreed that it was right that the Council should try to include the wording as suggested by the question in the paragraph above. He stated that this would be implemented and included in tender documents.

(e) Public question concerning the living wage

Peter Davies stated that it was nearly one year since the City Council discussed the implementation of the living wage agreement and, so far, only one of the Council's partners, Amey, had agreed to implement the living wage and other partners had not. He asked what the Council was going to do.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources stated that there were a number of partners that had not implemented the living wage and that some contracts were subject to a re-tendering process, including services run by Kier Asset Partnership and homecare provision. He stated that a meeting was to be held which would include Council officers and trade unions to consider the re-tendering of contracts and consideration was to be given in relation to including references to the living wage within tender documentation.

(f) Public Question concerning the Children and Families Bill

Adam Butcher asked, with reference to the Children and Families Bill, what the impact would be on the position of people with a disability or those with special educational needs.

In response, Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that she had asked Council officers to provide her with a briefing in connection with the Children and Families Bill, and especially concerning the issues affecting young people with special educational needs. The Council had provided a response in relation to the Green Paper. Councillor Drayton stated that she would write to the questioner with further information.

(g) Public question concerning Judicial Review of Children's Centres

Hannah Gibbins asked how the decision in the High Court to go ahead with a full Judicial Review would impact upon the impending closure of Children's Centres and employee reductions in Children's Centres and Early Years' Services across the City.

In response, Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that the Council intended to fully defend the application for Judicial Review in this case and it was important that the Council plans could proceed. At present, there was nothing legally which prevented the Council from implementing the decision. A report updating Members would be

presented to the Children, Young People and Families Scrutiny Committee on 4 July 2013. The Council was continuing monitor and support those organisations involved and affected by the Government budget cuts and also continuing to ensure that it fulfilled its statutory duties.

(h) Public question concerning Sustainable Communities Act

Vicky Seddon stated that Sheffield had committed itself to take part in the next process of the Sustainable Communities Act and was one of the first councils to do so, with cross party support. Last time, the Council used the Citizen's Panel as a mechanism to agree with people what proposals to make. She asked what process and formula would be used this time and had any decisions been made already on what suggestions would be put into the process.

In response, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, stated that the Sustainable Communities Act provided a way of challenging barriers that have an impact on local communities. The work previously undertaken relating to the Act was resource intensive in terms of the process which generated proposals to submit to the Government. However, the Council had lost 1,200 staff over the past 2 years and more staff would be lost this year. The Council therefore had to be realistic in relation to the second round of the Sustainable Communities Act. A Cabinet report would be produced, which would consider both the benefits and resources required.

(i) Public question concerning Burngreave New Deal for Communities and South Yorkshire Trading Standards

Martin Brighton referred to instances of incidents that had been years in the making, for example, the 'missing millions' of Burngreave New Deal for Communities or the South Yorkshire Trading Standards Unit. He asked what would the response be should an independent observer comment that the [Council's] current Chief Executive officer was handed a 'poisoned chalice'?

In response, Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that Mr Brighton had made an assertion regarding 'missing millions' and the Burngreave New Deal for Communities and the Chief Executive would have to answer for himself whether he thought he had been handed a 'poisoned chalice' as Mr Brighton had referred to it.

(j) Public questions concerning city centre shopping

Martin Brighton referred to Sheffield having dropped out of the top fifty places in the Country for having a good city centre shopping experience, to 63rd place. He asked, to what extent would the Council say this situation was a legacy of a decade ago?

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, stated that it was disappointing that the City had dropped down the table in terms of the range of retail to which Mr Brighton referred. In terms of actual spend in the City Centre, Sheffield was in 27th place. He stated

that Council was working to achieve improvements.

Councillor Bramall stated that he assumed the question was referring to the development of a retail quarter in the City Centre, which, he believed was the right thing to do for the City Centre. However, there had been a number of factors which contributed to delays, including the high number of small properties which had to be assimilated in to the site, associated planning applications, the global economic crisis and the cancellation of the grant for the scheme by the Government. The economic crisis was a main factor.

However, developments were moving forward, for example on the Moor, which was leading to significant improvement and the situation relating to the New Retail Quarter was close to a resolution and the Council was committed to deliver a scheme, either through the developer Hammersons or in another way.

(k) Public questions concerning policy and procedure relating to reported abuse of adults

Martin Brighton made reference to the Council's policy and procedure for dealing with reported abuse of adults. He asked for an explanation of how the procedure is circulated to all elected Members and officers; how the procedure is applied and its use monitored and how errant officers or elected members are brought into line.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living responded that the procedures for dealing with reported abuse of adults were available on the Council's website and on its intranet and included awareness for employees who were in regular contact with vulnerable adults. Training was available to Councillors regarding the application of safeguarding procedures in conjunction with Sheffield's Safeguarding Office.

A report on the operation of these procedures was submitted to the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee and individual cases were monitored through the Safeguarding Office and the Safeguarding Partnership Board, which was the responsible body. Councillor Lea stated that she was a member of the Partnership Board. If Members or officers did not adhere to the policy and procedure, they were subject to actions ranging from and including awareness training, and examination of their support needs. It was also a potential disciplinary issue within the conduct and disciplinary procedures of the City Council

(l) Public question concerning accountability

Martin Brighton stated that, last month, a question was asked about how officers and elected Members are held to account for repeated and costly mistakes. The politicians answer, quite reasonably, was that accountability was by the ballot box. However, he stated, if costly mistakes are repeatedly being made, leadership is called for, and the errant officers and elected members need timely correction so as to prevent further losses to the taxpayer. He asked, how is this achieved.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council responded that, previously, conduct was a matter for the Standards Board for England and local Standards Committee and that the Council also now had a complaints process through which Councillor could be called to account in relation to their conduct. The Council also had a complaints procedure and a disciplinary and supervisory process.

(m) Public question concerning sanctions

Martin Brighton stated that, if a citizen makes untrue statements about an elected member or an officer, that citizen is rightly rebuked by the Council, with threat of sanctions. He asked, what are the sanctions applied to elected members or officers who make untrue statements about a citizen?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council responded that sanctions were applied in accordance with the procedures referred to above and depending upon the level and severity of matter.

(n) Public question concerning licensing charges

Martin Brighton asked: what is the Council's estimate of the extent of its exposure to financial compensation to local businesses consequent upon the recent court case showing that local authorities have been overcharging for alcohol and other licences.

Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, responded that an article had been published in the Sheffield Star concerning Westminster Council and that it was unlawful for a local authority to make a profit from charges applied to licensing. Fees could pay for the costs of licensing, including enforcement. Westminster Council were reported as having failed to discharge this responsibility correctly. Most local authorities, it was suggested, were not like the case of Westminster, where there were particular circumstances and difficulties. The advice from the Council's legal and licensing officers was that the Council would be able to defend its position in relation to licensing fees.

(o) Public questions concerning outsourcing

Nigel Slack referred to two questions which he had asked at a meeting of the Council's Cabinet on 19 June 2013 and to concerns that the responses made by respective Cabinet Members were at least uninformative and at worst patronising and belittling. He stated that he was not satisfied with the tone and quality of the responses given.

Mr Slack gave further detail of the issues he raised and what he was hoping for from the responses. Firstly, in relation to Amey:

- The two articles he referred to quoted a letter from Amey to some of their staff.
- Was this letter sent out?

- Does it quote potential losses in the first year of £540,000?
- Why do this level of losses imply a “major financial risk” and what does that mean for the project and the city?
- Will the redeployment of 22 staff be local or will they be offered jobs away from the area to encourage voluntary redundancy, thereby avoiding the taint of compulsory redundancy?

Secondly, in relation to Capita:

- Are they busting their profit cap of 10%? Open book accounting should enable you to know this.
- Since the company’s accounts clearly show a disconnect between the rewards for front line and senior management, is this company ethically suitable to hold any future contracts with this City?
- If you are unsure about what is ethically acceptable in this arena, should you be starting a discussion on a policy decision that you all agree on and that will also give the public confidence?

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, responded that he was sorry that Mr Slack did not feel that the questions which he had submitted had been answered. He stated that it would be normal to assume that losses made in the early years of a contract would be made up in later years. Importantly, the outcomes that the Council purchased would not be affected. The City Council would carry the risks if Amey were not to carry the risk. Every month, Amey had replaced 1000 street lights, whereas previously, Streetforce had replaced 200 each year.

There were positive relationships with staff and the scale of the work being undertaken in the Streets Ahead project meant there had been no compulsory redundancies. The work had created 30 apprenticeships, 230 jobs and a further 500 jobs as part of the supply chain. Councillor Scott stated that he was proud of the work being undertaken.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated with regard to information concerning the turnover and profit of Capita, he believed that a factual response was provided to Mr Slack’s questions to Cabinet on 19 June. The profit which Capita made in relation to Sheffield did not exceed the 10 per cent margin, to which he had referred. In relation to ethical conduct, it could be argued that Capita had higher standards than some other companies. The Council had a process for tendering and criteria upon which submitted tenders would be judged. The Council could look at providers who potentially offered improved remuneration to front line staff, for example. However, it had to consider contracts as a whole and in terms of what was best for Sheffield.

(p) Public question concerning Jessops Edwardian Wing

Nigel Slack asked whether the Council was represented at the recent High Court hearing to decide on the potential Judicial Review concerning the planning decision to demolish the Grade 2 listed building known as the Jessops Edwardian Wing? If so how many of the 5 Barristers that appeared for the defendants were

paid for by the Council and what did it cost?

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, stated that with regard to the application for Judicial Review of the decision concerning the Jessops Edwardian Wing, the Council had employed the services of a Queen's Counsel and a more junior representative. He understood the decision of the Court was to be appealed. At this time, he did not have the precise costs of representation. The costs which would be awarded to the Council amounted to £5000, which was the maximum and this reflected the initial ruling of the Judge that the planning application process was both proper and appropriate. If the Council made a decision and it is challenged, it is right that it is able to defend itself. Councillor Bramall stated that the Council would await the outcome of the appeal.

(q) Public question concerning Food Safety

Nigel Slack referred to a recent report on Channel 4 News that the Government has turned the sale of Bovine Tuberculosis contaminated meat into a near 30,000 carcass per year industry. He asked if the Council had enquired of its catering contractors whether they use such contaminated meat in schools or residential homes, or what assurances it had received that they do not.

Councillor Jack Scott Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, responded that the Council had investigated all food providers and the Red Tractor providers of food for schools in particular. Trading Standards checked supplies of meat. The Food Standards Agency, with which the Council had regular contact, had requested the Council to conduct specific tests and a range of other testing was carried out by the Council's Trading Standards and Food Safety Teams. In schools, the Council had suspended the serving of burgers and other meats as a precaution. In relation to food quality, the Council was to look again at the City's Food Plan.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Urgent Business

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

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.

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, Integrated Transport, Pensions or Police under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6 (i).

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Ian Saunders to replace Councillor Ray Satur |
| Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Remove Councillor Ian Saunders to create a vacancy |
| Standards Committee | - | Councillor Peter Price to fill a vacancy |
| Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group | - | Councillor Jillian Creasy to fill a vacancy |
| Sheffield Homes Board of Directors | - | Councillors Tony Damms and Karen McGowan to fill vacancies |
| East Area Housing Board | - | Councillor Ibrar Hussain to fill a vacancy |
| North Area Housing Board | - | Councillors Garry Weatherall and Alan Law to fill vacancies |
| North West Area Housing Board | - | Councillors Richard Crowther and Bob Johnson to fill vacancies |
| South East Area Housing Board | - | Councillors Denise Fox and Chris Rosling Josephs to fill vacancies |
| South West Area Housing Board | - | Councillor Denise Reaney to fill a vacancy |
| | - | Councillor Roy Munn to fill a vacancy |

(b) representatives to other bodies be appointed, as follows:-

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Local Government Association Rural Commission | - | Councillor Tony Damms to fill a vacancy |
| Sheffield City Trust Group | - | Councillor Neale Gibson to replace |

Finances and General Purposes Committee		Councillor David Barker
Sheffield International Venues Ltd – Board of Directors	-	Councillor Neale Gibson to replace Councillor Peter Price
Sheffield Media and Exhibition Centre Ltd – Directors and Members	-	Councillor Nikki Sharpe to replace Councillor Neale Gibson
Southey/Owlerton Regeneration Board	Area -	Councillors Sioned-Mair Richards and Peter Price to fill vacancies

(c) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 15th May 2013, the Chief Executive had authorised the following appointments:-

Corporate Joint Committee with Trade Unions		Cllrs Julie Dore, Isobel Bowler, Leigh Bramall, Jackie Drayton, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Ian Saunders and Jack Scott to fill vacancies
---	--	--

Shadow Sheffield City Region Authority	-	Councillor Julie Dore to fill a vacancy
--	---	---

7. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

European ‘Transition Regions’ Funding

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the European Union has agreed that parts of the UK should receive ‘Transition Regions’ funding, which would include funding for South Yorkshire, despite opposition from the Government;
- (b) is dismayed that despite ‘Transition’ status, South Yorkshire is set to see a massively disproportionate reduction in its allocation of EU funding of up to 66%, due to the Government’s plans to re-allocate funding to protect Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland from “sudden and significant reductions”;
- (c) deplores Government plans to, in effect, take European funding away from South Yorkshire to give it to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, particularly when Scotland and Northern Ireland have a higher Gross Value Added score;

- (d) believes it is completely indefensible to take money away from South Yorkshire which would be spent on helping people into work, offering more apprenticeships and training, reducing emissions, building flood defences and helping business to export more and benefit from new technologies, and welcomes action taken by South Yorkshire MPs and MEPs in campaigning against this move;
- (e) is concerned by reports that Government Ministers in charge of allocating the funds are considering giving a larger share of funding to the south of England than was allocated in the last funding round in 2007; and
- (f) regrets that this Government and the Deputy Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, have yet again let Sheffield and South Yorkshire down and urges them to urgently reconsider these proposals and give South Yorkshire a fair deal.

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

- (a) welcomes the relative rise in prosperity in South Yorkshire, which has seen the region re-designated as a 'transition region';
- (b) regrets that, under the agreement approved by the previous Government, transition region funding to South Yorkshire reduced by 87% over just four years, from €153 million in 2007 to just €20 million by 2011;
- (c) notes reports, that far from Labour politicians' claims, South Yorkshire will actually see an increase in transition region funding next year from €20 million to €23 million;
- (d) highlights that this increase in funding comes in addition to massive levels of investment by the Coalition Government in Sheffield City Region, including:
 - (i) unlocking hundreds of millions of pounds of investment through the City Deal;
 - (ii) over £100 million for local businesses through the Regional Growth Fund;
 - (iii) more than £18 million for the Sheffield City Region through the Growing Places Fund;
 - (iv) £1.2 billion to enable the Streets Ahead project to proceed;
 - (v) £10 million to construct a Sheffield University Technical College and

another £10 million towards the world's most advanced research factory; and

- (vi) millions of pounds invested in Sheffield's transport infrastructure including trams, train services and greener buses;
- (e) further notes that the Administration is yet to publish how it has spent an existing £13 million of European Regional Development Fund currently allocated to a South Yorkshire JESSICA Fund; and
- (f) is disappointed that yet again the Administration are playing fast and loose with the facts in a desperate attempt to deflect attention from their own failings.

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

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

- For the amendment (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Trevor Bagshaw.
- Against the amendment (58) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Abstained on the amendment - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley)
(2) and Councillor Robert Murphy.

After a right of reply by Councillor Leigh Bramall, the original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the European Union has agreed that parts of the UK should receive 'Transition Regions' funding, which would include funding for South Yorkshire, despite opposition from the Government;
- (b) is dismayed that despite 'Transition' status, South Yorkshire is set to see a massively disproportionate reduction in its allocation of EU funding of up to 66%, due to the Government's plans to re-allocate funding to protect Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland from "sudden and significant reductions";
- (c) deplores Government plans to, in effect, take European funding away from South Yorkshire to give it to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, particularly when Scotland and Northern Ireland have a higher Gross Value Added score;
- (d) believes it is completely indefensible to take money away from South Yorkshire which would be spent on helping people into work, offering more apprenticeships and training, reducing emissions, building flood defences and helping business to export more and benefit from new technologies, and welcomes action taken by South Yorkshire MPs and MEPs in campaigning against this move;
- (e) is concerned by reports that Government Ministers in charge of allocating the funds are considering giving a larger share of funding to the south of England than was allocated in the last funding round in 2007; and
- (f) regrets that this Government and the Deputy Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, have yet again let Sheffield and South Yorkshire down and urges them to urgently reconsider these proposals and give South Yorkshire a fair deal.

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

For the Motion (58) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon)
and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson,
Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian
Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen
Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox,
Karen MCGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart

Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

- Against the Motion (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Trevor Bagshaw.
- Abstained on the Motion (2) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillor Robert Murphy.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Local Government Funding Cuts

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, that this Council:-

- (a) fully supports the open letter signed by 151 Council Leaders from all political parties to the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressing concerns that further cuts to local government in the next spending review would have a devastating impact on services;
- (b) recalls comments from the Chief Secretary to the Treasury, The Rt. Hon. Danny Alexander MP, that local government has "borne the brunt of deficit reduction", noting that Council funding from central government will have been cut by 33 per cent since this Government came into power and in comparison Whitehall departments will have faced average reductions of 12 per cent;

- (c) agrees with the letter that local government bore the brunt of cuts in the last spending review and for the sake of the public it cannot afford to do so again;
- (d) believes it would be bad for the country, bad for people and bad for our prospects of economic recovery if funding for local services is cut further; and
- (e) urges the Government to listen to the Local Government Association letter and also to reconsider the distribution of cuts which has resulted in heavy cuts to Sheffield whilst some councils in the wealthiest parts of the country receive almost no cuts at all.

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

- (a) regrets that Labour politicians still refuse to accept responsibility for the massive budget deficit they created;
- (b) laments the previous Government, who increased the national deficit year-on-year from 2001 onwards, reaching a total of £43 billion prior to the economic crash;
- (c) is pleased that Liberal Democrats took the responsible decision in 2010 to enter Government and help clear up the previous Government's mess;
- (d) understands that the Labour Party leadership have now returned from the economic wilderness and accepted that they will need to work within the Government's revenue spending plans;
- (e) therefore, believes that Labour politicians are acting in a hypocritical way by campaigning against cuts, which they have no intention of reversing;
- (f) regrets that repairing the nation's finances has resulted in difficult decisions across all levels of public spending, especially local government, and shares concerns about the financial challenges facing local government;
- (g) however, highlights that reducing the level of cuts for local government would mean reductions in spending in other areas, such as health, education or welfare;
- (h) furthermore, believes spending decisions for Sheffield City Council would be easier if the Administration did not continue to waste local taxpayers' money on political vanity projects; and
- (i) therefore, calls on the Administration to eliminate wasteful spending to ensure vital front-line services can be protected.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the relettering of paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (f); and
2. the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-
 - (e) regrets that the Comprehensive Spending Review completely disregarded the warnings of local leaders and produced more of the same with local government earmarked for one of the highest levels of reductions and Sir Merrick Cockell, Chairman of the Local Government Association, said the cut would "stretch essential services to breaking point in many areas".

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

After a right of reply by Councillor Julie Dore, the original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) fully supports the open letter signed by 151 Council Leaders from all political parties to the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressing concerns that further cuts to local government in the next spending review would have a devastating impact on services;
- (b) recalls comments from the Chief Secretary to the Treasury, The Rt. Hon. Danny Alexander MP, that local government has "borne the brunt of deficit reduction", noting that Council funding from central government will have been cut by 33 per cent since this Government came into power and in comparison Whitehall departments will have faced average reductions of 12 per cent;
- (c) agrees with the letter that local government bore the brunt of cuts in the last spending review and for the sake of the public it cannot afford to do so again;
- (d) believes it would be bad for the country, bad for people and bad for our prospects of economic recovery if funding for local services is cut further; and
- (e) regrets that the Comprehensive Spending Review completely disregarded the warnings of local leaders and produced more of the same with local government earmarked for one of the highest levels of reductions and Sir Merrick Cockell, Chairman of the Local Government Association, said the cut would "stretch essential services to breaking point in many areas".

- | |
|--|
| (f) urges the Government to listen to the Local Government Association letter and also to reconsider the distribution of cuts which has resulted in heavy cuts to Sheffield whilst some councils in the wealthiest parts of the country receive almost no cuts at all. |
|--|

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW SANGAR

Capital Programme 2012/13

At the request of Councillor Andrew Sangar (the mover of the motion) and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 9 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR CHRIS WELDON

'Blacklisting'

It was moved by Councillor Chris Weldon, seconded by Councillor Bob Johnson, that this Council:-

- (a) reiterates its support for the motion passed on 7th November 2012 condemning the practice of blacklisting;
- (b) notes comments by the Prime Minister on 12th June this year "the Government not only doesn't support blacklisting but has taken action against it";
- (c) further notes the reaction of Unite Assistant General Secretary, Gail Cartmail to the Prime Minister's comments:

"For Mr Cameron to claim the Tories have taken action against blacklisting is unbelievable and it's an insult to the victims. The Tories have done nothing to prevent blacklisting and Mr Cameron quite clearly opposes a full public inquiry. The Tories are displaying staggering complacency when they should be supporting a proper inquiry into this proven conspiracy."; and

- (d) resolves to write to the Deputy Prime Minister urging him to raise this issue with the Prime Minister, seeking a full investigation into blacklisting.

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

- 1. the deletion of the words "the Deputy Prime Minister urging him to raise this issue with" in paragraph (d)

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

(Note: With the consent of the Council, and at the request of Councillor Colin Ross (the mover of the Amendment), the Amendment, as included in the List of Amendments, was altered by the deletion of part 2 of the Amendment.)

It was then moved by Councillor Ray Satur, seconded by Councillor Terry Fox, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (g) as follows:-

- (e) welcomes the correspondence and actions of the Leader of the Council to arrange a meeting with the respective unions and Sheffield contractors to resolve issues surrounding blacklisting;
- (f) welcomes the inclusion of a clause in the procurement contract demonstrating the Council's commitment to tacking action to address blacklisting; and
- (g) urges the Government to take similar actions to tackle blacklisting at a national level.

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) reiterates its support for the motion passed on 7th November 2012 condemning the practice of blacklisting;
- (b) notes comments by the Prime Minister on 12th June this year "the Government not only doesn't support blacklisting but has taken action against it";
- (c) further notes the reaction of Unite Assistant General Secretary, Gail Cartmail to the Prime Minister's comments:

"For Mr Cameron to claim the Tories have taken action against blacklisting is unbelievable and it's an insult to the victims. The Tories have done nothing to prevent blacklisting and Mr Cameron quite clearly opposes a full public inquiry. The Tories are displaying staggering complacency when they should be supporting a proper inquiry into this proven conspiracy.";
- (d) resolves to write to the Deputy Prime Minister urging him to raise this issue with the Prime Minister, seeking a full investigation into blacklisting.
- (e) welcomes the correspondence and actions of the Leader of the Council to arrange a meeting with the respective unions and Sheffield contractors to resolve issues surrounding blacklisting;

- (f) welcomes the inclusion of a clause in the procurement contract demonstrating the Council's commitment to tacking action to address blacklisting; and
- (g) urges the Government to take similar actions to tackle blacklisting at a national level.

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK SCOTT

Decarbonisation

It was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Ray Satur, that this Council:-

- (a) fully supports the calls for a decarbonisation target in the Energy Bill and profoundly regrets that the recent amendment proposing one was defeated;
- (b) notes that had all Liberal Democrat MPs supported the amendment it could have been carried, however regrets that yet again MPs such as the Deputy Prime Minister placed their loyalty towards their Coalition colleagues above delivering real action on climate change;
- (c) believes that this typifies the present Government's abject failure to deliver meaningful action on climate change;
- (d) notes comments from Andy Atkins, Executive Director of Friends of the Earth: "The Liberal Democrat leadership's green credibility has been left in tatters after siding with the Conservatives to back a headlong dash for gas – this would send fuel bills rocketing and jobs overseas, and punch a gaping hole in our climate targets"; and also the comments of Doug Parr, Chief Scientist and Policy Director of Greenpeace UK: "For the sake of households struggling with gas bills, and for the sake of the climate, they [the Lib Dems] must not allow clean energy to be another concession to the Tory right."; and
- (e) warmly welcomes the commitment by HM Opposition to set a decarbonisation target in its election manifesto and believes this is an example of real action to tackle climate change.

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (e); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-

- (b) nevertheless welcomes the Bill as a roadmap for the UK's switch to “a low-carbon economy” and believes the Bill is a victory for Liberal Democrats in Government;
- (c) highlights the importance of Liberal Democrats in Government forcing Conservative Ministers to take warnings of climate change seriously, something that has been sadly ignored by previous Governments;
- (d) welcomes, in particular, the ground-breaking Green Deal, first proposed by Liberal Democrats, which the Council's Cabinet Member for Environment described as “fantastic news for Sheffield”;
- (e) furthermore, notes research by the Department of Energy & Climate Change, which demonstrates that the Coalition Government's climate change policies will save consumers roughly £166 in energy bills by 2020;
- (f) hopes that whoever forms the next Government will legislate for an effective 2030 decarbonisation target in 2016;
- (g) however, believes at a local level this Council should also promote green and sustainable methods of energy production; and
- (h) therefore, reaffirms its commitment to become the country's first decentralised energy city, entirely reliant on green energy produced within the City.

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

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (f) to (h) and against Paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of part 2 of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) fully supports the calls for a decarbonisation target in the Energy Bill and profoundly regrets that the recent amendment proposing one was defeated;
- (b) notes that had all Liberal Democrat MPs supported the amendment it could have been carried, however regrets that yet again MPs such as the Deputy Prime Minister placed their loyalty towards their Coalition colleagues above delivering real action on climate change;
- (c) believes that this typifies the present Government's abject failure to deliver meaningful action on climate change;
- (d) notes comments from Andy Atkins, Executive Director of Friends of the Earth: "The Liberal Democrat leadership's green credibility has been left in

tatters after siding with the Conservatives to back a headlong dash for gas – this would send fuel bills rocketing and jobs overseas, and punch a gaping hole in our climate targets"; and also the comments of Doug Parr, Chief Scientist and Policy Director of Greenpeace UK: "For the sake of households struggling with gas bills, and for the sake of the climate, they [the Lib Dems] must not allow clean energy to be another concession to the Tory right."; and

- (e) warmly welcomes the commitment by HM Opposition to set a decarbonisation target in its election manifesto and believes this is an example of real action to tackle climate change.

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

For the Motion (57)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Robert Murphy, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against the Motion (18)

- Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Trevor Bagshaw.

Abstained on the Motion (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley).

(Note: 1. Councillors Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraph (a) and against Paragraphs (b) to (e) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillor Terry Fox, having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the above item of business, took no part in the voting thereon.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND

Job Creation

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Denise Reaney, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that Liberal Democrats in Government are working to build a stronger economy and a fairer society;
- (b) notes that since the 2010 General Election, more than one million private sector jobs have been created in the United Kingdom, alongside a massive expansion in the number of young people starting apprenticeships;
- (c) wholeheartedly welcomes the Liberal Democrat 'A Million Jobs' campaign, which now aims to create one million more jobs in Britain;
- (d) in particular, backs measures delivered by the Coalition Government which will help generate jobs in the Sheffield City Region, and welcomes the following outcomes:
 - (i) new jobs and investment at the Advanced Manufacturing Park;
 - (ii) a new University Technical College for Sheffield, which will provide the skills the next generation of Sheffielders need to compete; and
 - (iii) 5,430 young people starting an apprenticeship in Sheffield in just one year, a 54% increase on the previous Government's last year in office;
- (e) thanks the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam for helping to secure investment for our City and supports his proposals, made in a recent speech in Sheffield, for a Local Growth Committee to ensure more power is devolved to regions; and
- (f) agrees to give its full backing to the 'A Million Jobs' campaign and directs that a copy of this motion is forwarded to all Sheffield MPs.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Geoff Smith, seconded by Councillor

Julie Dore, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of all the words after the words 'in Government' in paragraph (a) and their substitution by the words 'and particularly the Deputy Prime Minister, offer a record of broken promises and betrayal, with their primary record being their failure to deliver any significant growth plan';
2. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-
 - (b) further believes that the Government, with Liberal Democrats' support, have presided over the weakest economic recovery in recent history and have a record of creating a flatlining economy during their time in Government;
 - (c) regrets that youth unemployment reached over 1 million whilst the Liberal Democrats were in Government and deplores the complacent failure of this Government who scrapped the Future Jobs Fund and have introduced a range of policies damaging to young people, including trebling tuition fees and scrapping Education Maintenance Allowance;
 - (d) remembers numerous measures introduced by the Government, with Liberal Democrats' support, which have damaged Sheffield's local economy, including scrapping the loan to Sheffield Forgemasters, abolishing Regional Development Agencies and the latest proposals to re-allocate huge amounts of EU economic development funding away from Sheffield and South Yorkshire;
 - (e) expresses its disbelief at claims that the Liberal Democrats are creating a fairer society and recalls that the Government, with Liberal Democrats' support, have cut the level of income tax paid by the highest earners at the same time as they have increased VAT, introduced unfair cuts to welfare, including the "Bedroom Tax", and cut tax credits, all impacting on hardworking families on low and middle incomes;
 - (f) notes that the current Administration have driven the growth in apprenticeships, funding a 100 Apprenticeship Scheme, the RISE graduation scheme, and developing and part-funding the unique Skills Made Easy apprenticeship programme;
 - (g) notes that this Administration's record sits in stark contrast to the record of the previous Administration, which did nothing to promote apprenticeships, and broke yet another promise to young people by secretly backtracking on a promise of its Leader to match the previous Government's investment in the Future Jobs Fund; and
 - (h) agrees to continue to support job creation in the City, however, is

extremely concerned that the Government's failure to produce a credible economic plan will continue to damage jobs and growth in Sheffield.

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 Liberal Democrats in Government and particularly the Deputy Prime Minister, offer a record of broken promises and betrayal, with their primary record being their failure to deliver any significant growth plan;
- (b) further believes that the Government, with Liberal Democrats' support, have presided over the weakest economic recovery in recent history and have a record of creating a flatlining economy during their time in Government;
- (c) regrets that youth unemployment reached over 1 million whilst the Liberal Democrats were in Government and deplores the complacent failure of this Government who scrapped the Future Jobs Fund and have introduced a range of policies damaging to young people, including trebling tuition fees and scrapping Education Maintenance Allowance;
- (d) remembers numerous measures introduced by the Government, with Liberal Democrats' support, which have damaged Sheffield's local economy, including scrapping the loan to Sheffield Forgemasters, abolishing Regional Development Agencies and the latest proposals to re-allocate huge amounts of EU economic development funding away from Sheffield and South Yorkshire;
- (e) expresses its disbelief at claims that the Liberal Democrats are creating a fairer society and recalls that the Government, with Liberal Democrats' support, have cut the level of income tax paid by the highest earners at the same time as they have increased VAT, introduced unfair cuts to welfare, including the "Bedroom Tax", and cut tax credits, all impacting on hardworking families on low and middle incomes;
- (f) notes that the current Administration have driven the growth in apprenticeships, funding a 100 Apprenticeship Scheme, the RISE graduation scheme, and developing and part-funding the unique Skills Made Easy apprenticeship programme;
- (g) notes that this Administration's record sits in stark contrast to the record of the previous Administration, which did nothing to promote apprenticeships, and broke yet another promise to young people by secretly backtracking on a promise of its Leader to match the previous

- Government's investment in the Future Jobs Fund; and
- (h) agrees to continue to support job creation in the City, however, is extremely concerned that the Government's failure to produce a credible economic plan will continue to damage jobs and growth in Sheffield.

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraph (h) and abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) to (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Arts and Creative Industries

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

- (a) notes the importance to the UK of the arts and creative industries, with art and culture enriching the lives of individuals, reinforcing a sense of local community, and being vital to the economy, generating more than £36 billion a year and employing 1.5 million people;
- (b) calls on the Government actively to support the arts by developing a strategy for the arts and creative industries;
- (c) believes that this should include putting creativity at the heart of education, ensuring that creative industries have access to finance and funding, protecting intellectual property, supporting the arts and creative industries, including museums and galleries, in all nations and regions of the country, not just London, and attracting inward investment and providing support for exports;
- (d) recognises that it is not only right in principle that the arts should be for everyone but that the arts thrive when they draw on the pool of talent of young people from every part of the country and all walks of life; and
- (e) believes that a strong Department for Culture, Media and Sport, with a Secretary of State standing up for the arts, is crucial.

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

- For the Motion (74)
- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Simon Clement-Jones, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Shaffaq Mohammed, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain,

Talib Hussain, Robert Murphy, Mohammed Maroof, Rob Frost, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Mazher Iqbal, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Anders Hanson, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Trevor Bagshaw, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

- Against the Motion (0) - Nil.
- Abstained on the Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley).

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

Sheffield Castle Site

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Gill Furniss, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the Castle Market was built on the site of the original Sheffield Castle which was first mentioned in written records in 1184;
- (b) further notes that demolition of the current Castle Market presents a unique opportunity to excavate the Castle site and incorporate it into a wider regeneration strategy for the area;
- (c) notes the Administration's plans to fully excavate the ruins of the Castle's foundations and open them to the general public;
- (d) confirms that the Administration is in discussions with the Heritage Lottery Fund to try and secure the necessary resources to excavate the site;
- (e) furthermore, confirms the Administration's intention to incorporate community involvement as a key element of any plans for excavation and

- display of any Castle remains and/or artefacts found at the site; and
- (f) therefore commits to begin stakeholder engagement this summer with interested parties and the public, and to re-form the cross-party Castle Member Group and to work with the Friends of Sheffield Castle Group, to begin discussions on how to progress the project for the benefit of Sheffield and the Castlegate area.

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

Welfare Reform

It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Katie Condliffe, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the announcement by the Shadow Chancellor, The Rt. Hon. Ed Balls MP, that the Labour Party are considering proposals for a Regional Benefits Cap;
- (b) believes this policy would amount to an attack on the people of Sheffield and regrets that the Labour Party leadership are proposing a policy so damaging to our City;
- (c) furthermore notes the comments of the ex-Chief Whip of the Labour Party and MP for Newcastle East, who ridiculed the proposals;
- (d) is delighted that the Liberal Democrat Chief Secretary to the Treasury, The Rt. Hon. Danny Alexander MP, has stated that there is “no prospect” of the current Government introducing a regional cap and highlights his comments that “In terms of regionalising benefits, for me as a Liberal Democrat, it's just a non-starter”; and
- (e) calls upon the Leader of the Council to write to the Shadow Chancellor, condemning this unfair proposal, and use her influence in the Labour Party to ensure this policy is not adopted.

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

1. the re-lettering of paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (f); and
 2. the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-
- (e) shares the concerns of a Labour Councillor for Nether Edge that the Labour Party have a “lack of courage” and that their values are not “obvious”;

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

It was then moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Martin Lawton, as an amendment, that the original Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) notes the present Government's shambolic mismanagement of welfare reform;
- (b) reiterates opposition to many of the Government welfare cuts, including the "Bedroom Tax", cuts to council tax benefit, the introduction of Personal Independence Payments, which is a clear intention to reduce benefits for the most vulnerable, and the mismanagement of the introduction of universal credit;
- (c) notes research by Sheffield Hallam University which indicates that the overall impact of welfare reform for Sheffield is likely to be in the region of £173 million per annum, which equates to a financial loss to this City of £471 per annum for an average working age adult in the City;
- (d) further notes that this research indicates that the wealthiest areas in the country are significantly less hit by these welfare reforms and believes that Sheffield is being unfairly targeted by the Government's welfare reforms; and
- (e) believes it is unbelievable for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group to criticise the Shadow Chancellor on the issue of welfare given their own party's disastrous record in Government.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the present Government's shambolic mismanagement of welfare reform;
- (b) reiterates opposition to many of the Government welfare cuts, including the "Bedroom Tax", cuts to council tax benefit, the introduction of Personal Independence Payments, which is a clear intention to reduce benefits for the most vulnerable, and the mismanagement of the introduction of universal credit;
- (c) notes research by Sheffield Hallam University which indicates that the overall impact of welfare reform for Sheffield is likely to be in the region of £173 million per annum, which equates to a financial loss to this City of £471 per annum for an average working age adult in the City;

- (d) further notes that this research indicates that the wealthiest areas in the country are significantly less hit by these welfare reforms and believes that Sheffield is being unfairly targeted by the Government's welfare reforms; and
- (e) believes it is unbelievable for the Leader of the Main Opposition Group to criticise the Shadow Chancellor on the issue of welfare given their own party's disastrous record in Government.

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) and abstained on Paragraphs (a) and (e) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER

Business Improvement Districts

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

- (a) notes reports in The Sheffield Star on 17th June 2013 that Sheffield City Council is considering the introduction of a 'hotel tax';
- (b) believes a 'hotel tax' could ultimately damage Sheffield's economy and result in a loss of jobs;
- (c) regrets that the current Administration have dreamt up yet another poorly-thought-through 'anti-business' proposal; and
- (d) calls on the Administration to immediately rule out the possibility of a 'hotel tax' and work with local businesses instead of against them.

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

1. the deletion of all the words after the words 'June 2013 that' in paragraph (a) and their substitution by the words "Sheffield Council, with its partners, is investigating a number of methods such as creating Business Improvement Districts which are partnerships within which businesses agree to contribute funding towards events that boost their own businesses."
2. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (d) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-
 - (b) notes that Business Improvement Districts operate successfully in other parts of the UK and are designed to enable local businesses

to identify opportunities to benefit their business;

- (c) confirms that Sheffield is progressing its first Business Improvement District to improve flood defences in the Lower Don Valley right now, with the support of local businesses;
- (d) confirms that no new Business Improvement District would be created without a ballot of businesses within the district, therefore meaning that any decision to create a Business Improvement District would be that of local businesses, not the Council;
- (e) further confirms that should a Business Improvement District be created, decisions directing spending of any income generated would also be made by local businesses; and
- (f) confirms that Business Improvement Districts are a way of putting local businesses in control of funding which can be spent to improve their business and resolves to continue to work with the business community to support the creation of one, should this be the wish of local businesses.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes reports in The Sheffield Star on 17th June 2013 that Sheffield Council, with its partners, is investigating a number of methods such as creating Business Improvement Districts which are partnerships within which businesses agree to contribute funding towards events that boost their own businesses;
- (b) notes that Business Improvement Districts operate successfully in other parts of the UK and are designed to enable local businesses to identify opportunities to benefit their business;
- (c) confirms that Sheffield is progressing its first Business Improvement District to improve flood defences in the Lower Don Valley right now, with the support of local businesses;
- (d) confirms that no new Business Improvement District would be created without a ballot of businesses within the district, therefore meaning that any decision to create a Business Improvement District would be that of local businesses, not the Council;
- (e) further confirms that should a Business Improvement District be created, decisions directing spending of any income generated would also be made by local businesses; and

- (f) confirms that Business Improvement Districts are a way of putting local businesses in control of funding which can be spent to improve their business and resolves to continue to work with the business community to support the creation of one, should this be the wish of local businesses.

This page is intentionally left blank