

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 1 August 2012

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Harry Harpham (Deputy Chair), Isobel Bowler, Leigh Bramall, Jackie Drayton, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Bryan Lodge and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Jack Scott.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11th July 2012 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

Petitions

4.1 Proposed Changes to the No.66 bus service

4.1.1 The Cabinet received a petition containing 1,154 signatures from residents of the High Green and Chapeltown areas (a) complaining that they had not had the chance to be effectively consulted with on the proposed changes to the No. 66 bus route which ran through High Green (b) indicating that they had no library, forum or other avenue through which they could have collected consultation questionnaires to have their say, had they been distributed (c) commenting that local residents of High Green relied on the direct route from High Green to Rotherham, including elderly residents and students going to the Thomas Rotherham College, as well as relying on the service as a swift, direct route to Sheffield's City Centre (d) suggesting that the proposed No. 13 bus route via Fox Hill would take longer and (e) calling upon elected members to campaign against the proposals set out in the Sheffield Partnership consultation 2012, which provided for the No. 66 service to run as far as Chapeltown only, as they wished to keep a reliable No. 66 bus service running through High Green to serve their community.

4.1.2 Jane-Marie Bellamy, on behalf of the High Green Action Team, addressed Cabinet and stated that the No. 66 service provided the most direct and reliable service for High Green residents passengers wishing to visit the Sheffield City Centre. The removal of the No 66 Service would also make visits to Rotherham

Hospital out of hours very difficult, requiring the use of three buses.

- 4.1.3 She added that the frequency of other services such as the No. 75 and No. 87 services only ran to and from High Green every hour and that the infrequency of the No 75 and 87 bus services and the low numbers of passengers using the services was a total waste of resources. Efficiencies in the use of resources and fuel economies could be more effectively secured by maintaining and, improving the current No 66 Service, where possible, by readjusting the balance between the frequency of that service and that of the No 75 and 87 services, some of which could terminate at Chapeltown. In addition, the condition of the buses used on the No. 66 Service was generally poor, the buses being generally old.
- 4.1.4 Residents in the High Green area were, with the loss of various community facilities and bus services to Meadowhall and Barnsley, feeling increasingly isolated.
- 4.1.5 Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) responded that the City Council did not have the power to make decisions on bus routes but that this role was fulfilled by the Sheffield Bus Partnership, of which the Council, the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYLTE) and bus operators were participants. He stated that he would refer the comments now made by Ms Bellamy and the detail of the petition to the SYLTE for discussion with the bus operators within the Partnership. He added that during the latest consultation on bus services and, as part of the development of a Bus Partnership Agreement, representations from organisations and members of the public had been listened to and adjustments made to the proposed Agreement, where possible, in order to take account of public concerns on bus services. However, the configuration of bus services across the City was a complex issue, for example, the route of the No. 13 Service had implications for other areas.
- 4.1.6 Councillor Bramall informed Ms. Bellamy that he would ask the SYLTE to respond to the concerns outlined in the petition.
- 4.2 Proposed changes to timetable for the No. 44 bus service
- 4.2.1 The Cabinet received a petition containing 762 signatures from residents of the Basegreen and Birley areas (a) bitterly disagreeing with the changes to the 44 bus service times, (b) expressing concern that to have no buses would cut off residents of Basegreen and Birley completely as not everyone could walk to tram stops (c) suggesting that hospital or family visiting in the evening would come to an end as a result and (d) stating that those who needed the bus, the elderly and families without cars, would suffer again from these cuts to their service.
- 4.2.2 Terry Andrews of the Basegreen Tenants and Residents Association, addressed Cabinet indicating that the Basegreen estate was served only by

one bus service, namely the No. 44 service, and that he understood that proposals to remove the bus link between the Basegreen area and the Crystal Peaks shopping centre as well as the removal of the evening bus service had now been rejected and that the bus service would remain as it was. Mr Andrews sought confirmation of his understanding of the position.

4.2.3 Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) and responded that he understood that the retention of the No. 44 bus service was an issue to be considered for final approval as part of the Bus Partnership Agreement.

4.2.4 Councillor Bramall added that, in general terms, the proposed Bus Partnership Agreement sought to increase the reliability and sustainability of bus services across the City and that the majority of respondents in the Partnership's consultation had indicated that they were relatively satisfied with the changes proposed as they offered, amongst other things, lower fares and more frequent buses, although he recognised that 5% - 10% of the responses were negative. He added that the proposed Agreement would provide for the holding of quarterly Partnership meetings with no changes being made to bus services without prior consultations being held between Partners.

4.3 Proposed changes to the No. 4 bus service

4.3.1 The Cabinet received a petition containing 625 signatures (a) objecting to the proposed withdrawal of the No. 4 bus service from Millhouses to the City Centre via Psalter Lane and Cemetery Road and replacing it with the No.83 service running along Ecclesall Road (b) suggesting that if the proposal was accepted, there would be 24 buses per hour on Ecclesall Road and none along Psalter Lane and (c) requesting that the No. 83 service ran along Psalter Lane from Banner Cross to link up with its route in the City Centre.

4.3.2 Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) reported that the petition had been referred to the SYPTE and that action was being taken to re-tender a new No. 4 bus service including a route along Psalter Lane to Ecclesall Road South which would be included in the new Bus Partnership Agreement. He drew attention to and welcomed the work carried out by local Councillors Nikki Bond and Qurban Hussain in support of the petition.

Public Questions

Mr Nigel Slack_made the following statement in relation to the Council's public questions procedure:-

4.3 "Recent election turnouts indicate that the public's connection to politics and their trust in politicians both nationally and locally is at an all time low. If this trend continues politicians, particularly at a local level may become redundant in the public's eyes, as they perceive that local elections are just a temperature check on national issues and that you can't trust any of them

anyway. With this in mind I believe it is time for this Cabinet to consider it's and the Full Council's role in reconnecting with the public and revitalising public involvement. I believe that the Community Assemblies are a good step forward along this road, particularly because they give an opportunity for regular input from local interest groups and individual members of the public.

- 4.4 The 'Questions' process however is another matter. Having asked a number of questions at Council lately, it appears to me that there is a lacklustre approach from most members to public questions. In fact, at times the responses seem to be automatically defensive or even dismissive. Indeed the last Cabinet meeting became quite testy, both myself and a member of the Somali community, were unable to comment on inaccuracies in the responses from Cabinet Members and I was almost prevented from asking my second question by the chair of the meeting. On finally being allowed to ask the question I got the definite feeling from the Chair that this was nothing more than a chore. This may not have been intentional but that was how it felt. As a result I suspect the thrust of my question was obscured by my annoyance.
- 4.4.1 Those of us that ask questions are not always here to 'Bash' the council, some of us actually hope to help, and to improve the lot of the Sheffield public. I have no party political axe to grind but I am a great advocate of open government and transparent honesty in public life. Where I have concerns I want to feel that I will be listened to openly, not defensively, and that members will address the question I ask, not try to make it look good for the minutes, or for party political advantage.
- 4.4.2 Despite what was said at Cabinet last time, there is no injunction in the Council's Constitution against comments or requests for clarification from questioners, it appears to be entirely at the Chair's discretion."
- 4.4.3. Mr Slack asked would the Cabinet therefore undertake to review the 'Public Questions' process to specifically enable one follow up comment or request for clarification to be available to members of the public or, at the very least look at improving the guidelines to Councillors on how to answer these questions?"
- 4.4.4. Councillor Julie Dore (Leader) responded that she was sure she could speak on behalf of the whole Cabinet, including Councillor Harry Harpham, who chaired the last meeting, that it was definitely not a "chore" to respond to public questions and that all Cabinet Members took all public questions seriously. She stated that, sometimes, there was some confusion in the understanding of the role of Council and Cabinet and she pointed out that Council took few decisions except where its statutory functions needed to be exercised such as the appointment of a Leader or the setting of the Council's budget and Council Tax level, but that Council did provide a forum for the submission to public questions and petitions which would be the subject of a response by a Cabinet member and might initiate a debate at a future meeting.

- 4.4.5 Councillor Dore stated that, where a public question was asked, Cabinet and Council were unable to make a decision on the matter as there was a due process to follow in taking decisions. However, there were many opportunities for members of the public to raise issues with Councillors through ward surgeries, attendance at public forums, Tenants' and Residents' associations etc. Additionally, last year, the Council provided a further opportunity for members of the public to ask questions of Cabinet members through the Cabinet in the Community meetings which had been held in each Community Assembly area to ensure that those areas without Cabinet representation were able to ask the Cabinet questions on policies and services in an open forum. This Programme had received positive public feedback and the Programme would be repeated in the Autumn of this year in a somewhat different form which would accommodate a more open debate for part of the meeting. However, Cabinet meetings were not an appropriate forum for public debates and its primary responsibility was to take executive decisions on behalf of the Authority.
- 4.4.6 The Council also hoped to review the role of Community Assemblies, as it was felt that they were not particularly well attended and were and were also looking to encourage public participation and engagement in the shaping of decisions through a "Voice and Influence " Programme.
- 4.4.7 Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) referred to the holding of the Local Democracy Week event between 15 and 21st October, 2012 organised by the Council in partnership with Sheffield for Democracy, Workers Educational association, South Yorkshire Police, Age UK and other organisations and he, like other members of the Cabinet, recognised the importance of working closely with communities to engage with them in discussion on policies and services. He added the funding referred to came directly from Government through the Community First Programme and had been passported directly by Office of Civil Society to community organisations. £1,102,075 had been allocated to run over a 4 year period, from 2011-2015 and he acknowledged that it was important that small groups were able to access this funding

Mr. Martin Brighton asked the following questions and made the following observations:-

4.5.1 Outstanding Information

- 4.5.1 From May 2011 this citizen has asked this Cabinet many questions. Many of the answers have not included the information needed to answer them, rather the questions were batted away with excuses for not answering, counter-questions, or expressions of opinion as to why they were not answered, etc. Would this Council please note this formal request that a review of those answers is to be made, and, where the information was not provided, it is provided in writing, or formally refused, in statements suitable for presentation to the Information Commissioner.

- 4.5.2 Councillor Julie Dore (Leader) referred to her previous answer to Mr Slack in

terms of the different means of engaging with Councillors and the role of Council and Cabinet meetings. In particular, she referred to the opportunity to engage with Councillors through correspondence, ward surgeries, Community assemblies and Scrutiny Committees. Should members of the public require further information than that given in Cabinet Member responses to public questions at Cabinet, then that opportunity was provided outside of Cabinet meetings through, for example correspondence. Public questions could not be treated as Freedom of Information requests, which were required to be submitted to the Authority under a separate process, whereupon a response would be given.

- 4.5.3 Councillor Harry Harpham (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) added that if Mr Brighton wished to submit any documentation to him he would provide a response, where this was appropriate. Referring back to the comments made by Mr Slack, Councillor Harpham apologised to Mr Slack if he had thought that answering questions at the last Cabinet meeting looked like it was a “chore” for Cabinet Members as he was well aware of the huge privilege conferred upon him to take decisions on behalf of citizens in this City.

4.5.4 Imposition of Council-favoured groups.

- 4.5.5 This citizen has raised this issue several times. Each time it is declared that no such imposition takes place, only for the impositions to be repeated. The Council cannot be believed in this regard any more.

Please explain why this Council approves of the imposition of the Council’s local forum over community groups in the Lowedges, Batemoor, Jordanthorpe area with respect to access to funding.

- 4.5.6 Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) responded that if Mr Brighton let him have a copy of the documents he referred to, he would respond to him. Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) added that the funding referred to came directly from Government through the Community First Programme and had been passported directly by the Council to community organisations. It was intended that a mini-evaluation of how the £1 million Community First funding was spent over the next few years and he acknowledged that it was important that small groups were able to access this funding.

4.5.7 Accuracy of the public record.

- 4.5.8 It has been proposed by Sheffield Homes that the amendment of inaccurate records is dependent upon their assigned status of the person reporting those inaccuracies.

What is the Council’s view of this policy, and what is the Council’s policy on this issue?

4.5.9 Councillor Julie Dore (Leader) responded that she was unable to comment on the response of Sheffield Homes as she had no access to their documents. The accuracy of Cabinet minutes were agreed by Cabinet and they would be amended, if Cabinet, as the body who had taken the decisions reflected in the minutes, felt that this was appropriate.

4.5.10 Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) suggested that if Mr Brighton let him have a copy of the Sheffield Homes letter referred to, he would respond to him.

5. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

5.1 The Deputy Chief Executive reported that there had been no items of business called in for scrutiny arising from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 July 2012.

5.2 The Cabinet noted the information reported.

6. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

6.1 The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Cabinet :-

(a) places on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the City Council by the following staff in the Portfolios below:-

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
<u>Children, Young People and Families</u>		
Pauline Holmes	Pauline Holmes	Pauline Holmes
Kelvin Leaver	Kelvin Leaver	Kelvin Leaver
Barbara Round	Teacher, Yewlands School	35
William Huw Thomas	Headteacher, Emmaus Catholic and C of E Primary School	25
<u>Communities</u>		
Barbara Berwick	Support Worker	23
Marion Burrows	Application Development Manager	33

Keith Clark	Approved Mental Health Practitioner	23
Julie Coupland	Support Worker	20
Dawn Ellison	Support Worker	24
Linda Harrison	Assistant Operational Manager	29
Sharon Marsden	Support Worker	23
Joan McGann	Support Worker	24
June Mundun	Support Worker	27
Sandra Pathan	Support Worker	28
Marilyn Lesley Porter	Support Worker	32
Joy Robertshaw	Support Worker	23
Marie Smith	Support Worker	29
Christine Walton	Learning and Development Consultant	26
Jane Whittington	Support Worker	27
Philip Wright	Support Worker	21

Deputy Chief Executive's

Julian Ward	Lawyer	42
-------------	--------	----

Place

Stephen Byers	Environmental Policy Co-ordinator	34
---------------	-----------------------------------	----

(b) extends to them its best wishes for the future and a long and happy retirement;

(c) directs that an appropriate extract of this resolution under the Common Seal of the Council be forwarded to them; and

(d) wishes to place on record its particular thanks to Julian Ward (Lawyer), for his support of the Council's decision making process in relation to Planning and Hghways, and Stephen Byers (Environmental Policy Co-ordinator), for his valuable work with schools on environmental education.

7. EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet:-

7.1 AGENDA ITEM 9: ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING – FEES POLICY 2012 -13

7.1.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report containing proposed revisions to the existing Adult and Community Learning Fees Policy funded by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) and organised by the Council's Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities Service (LLSC) in response to the requirements of the SFA. The key revision was that, as from August 2013, those people studying for Level 3 (equivalent to A level study over the age of 24) will be required to take out a loan to pay their fees, with repayments of loans being made in accordance with future earnings levels.

7.1.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet :-

- (a) notes the information contained in the report now submitted; and
- (b) approves the Adult and Community Learning Fees Policy 2012 -13 as set out in the report.

7.1.3 Reasons for Recommendations

The decision will allow the City to secure its adult learning funding thereby providing access to learning for those residents most in need of improved skills levels and the qualifications needed for work and improved life chances.

7.1.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The option of halting the delivery of those courses for which the charging of fees is now required was considered and rejected as it would not allow equal access to learning for those very vulnerable learners, particularly from the BME communities who need language support to help them to play a positive role in their community and to contribute to the local economy

7.2 AGENDA ITEM 10: THE SHEFFIELD INVESTMENT FUND

7.2.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report setting out how the City Council might lead a strategic and innovative approach to the use of its property asset base to develop an Investment Fund, namely, 'The Sheffield Investment Fund'. The ultimate objective and targeted output of the Fund would be to assist in the regeneration and sustainable growth of the local economy with associated benefits to the workforce and people of Sheffield.

7.2.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet :-

- (a) to the establishment of the Sheffield Investment Fund as outlined in the report now submitted; and
- (b) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and the Director of Legal Services to :-
 - (i) establish the fund through the capital programme on the basis that the fund will not normally be for “gap” funding, but will be for investment purposes, generating a cash return on the investment with a payback of the capital at the end of the term of the investment;
 - (ii) establish an appropriate governance structure;
 - (iii) establish the Fund’s Investment Strategy, project selection process and linkage, where appropriate, to the Sheffield City Region Investment Fund;
 - (iv) agree the procurement strategy and award if it is determined that the best way of delivering the output is by creating a special purpose vehicle or entering into a joint venture;
 - (v) negotiate, agree and complete the legal agreements required to give effect to the above arrangements; and
 - (vi) make any other decision required to enable the creation and operation of the Sheffield Investment Fund including the use of a Fund Manager, where deemed appropriate, as procured for the South Yorkshire Urban Development Fund.

7.2.3 Reasons for Decision

The underlying benefit of this proposal is that it utilises the Council’s asset base in a measured way to assist economic growth and progress in the City where, but for the appropriate funding being available, there are viable projects that can help to deliver jobs and other economic activity.

It is proposed that through the Capital Programme Approval process, including subsequent Cabinet approvals, the Council establishes the Sheffield Investment Fund to help progress the priorities of the Corporate Plan

7.2.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The alternative option would be not to create an investment fund to assist economic growth using our own asset base as a source of funds and to leave such matters to the market.

The current economic conditions and restrictions on the availability of bank finance mean that projects that are otherwise viable are stalled due to that lack of funding and that is the state of the current market.

We could restrict our activity of investment in such projects to the South Yorkshire Development Fund. However, the creation of a Sheffield Investment Fund would be complimentary to other funds created in the region, and would be focussed on Sheffield.

7.3 AGENDA ITEM 11: ESTABLISHMENT OF HEALTHWATCH SHEFFIELD – CONTRACT MATTERS

7.3.1 The Executive Director, Communities, submitted a report seeking approval to the procurement strategy, specifications and contract award for Healthwatch Sheffield.

7.3.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the procurement strategy and draft specification for Healthwatch Sheffield and the advocacy service
- (b) delegates to the Executive Director, Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with the Health, Care and Independent Living Portfolio and the Director of Commercial Services, the decision to award the contracts and to determine the terms and conditions upon which the contracts will be awarded; and
- (c) delegates to the Executive Director, Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with the Health, Care and Independent Living Portfolio, the ability to take action which he feels is necessary to achieve the outcomes outlined in the report.

7.3.3 Reasons for Recommendations

The Council has a duty to obtain 'Best value' in any service that it delivers.

Stakeholders have indicated that Healthwatch needs to provide innovative ways to gather and include their views. Tendering will maximise opportunities for creativity and innovation in the delivery of Healthwatch.

Sheffield City Council Standing Orders indicate the requirement to tender for services where the contract value exceeds £50,000.

UK/European regulations require that the procurement process is open, fair, transparent and non-discriminatory and that Service and that supply contracts over £173,000 must be subject to competitive tender.

Letting the complaints advocacy service as a separate lot within one tender gives the best possibility of a strong professional service for citizens that

complements rather than detracts from the overall Healthwatch vision.

7.3.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

The Council is prohibited under the Act from delivering Healthwatch itself.

In compliance with the Council's Standing Orders, European finance regulations and the strongly expressed views of Sheffield stakeholders, there was no other realistic option other than to go out to tender for an overall Healthwatch contract.

An options appraisal for the complaints advocacy component of the contract has been completed. This included stakeholder views of available options. The highest scoring option recommended that the complaints aspect be let as a separate lot alongside the overarching Healthwatch lot within one tender process.

7.4 **AGENDA ITEM 12: ANNUAL EQUALITIES AND INCLUSION REPORT 2011-12**

7.4.1 The Deputy Chief Executive submitted the Council's Annual Equalities and Inclusion Report 2012 -13 which provided an overview of progress and challenges on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), an update on progress on objectives in the Single Equality Scheme 2010 -13, an outline of the priorities, work underway and challenges, focused around work required to meet our equality duties and local priorities and recommendations for action.

7.4.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) agrees the proposal's in the report now submitted including the Action Plans;
- (b) agrees the new Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy; and
- (c) focus the Council's attention, via the Strategic Equality Board, on :-
 - (i) ensuring the Council has joined up approaches to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI), including working with partners to deliver joint equality approaches and objectives;
 - (ii) strengthening civic participation through representation on boards in line with the city population e.g. women, disabled, BME people, etc;
 - (iii) strengthening monitoring and reporting of hate incidents and discrimination to ensure we are working to eliminate discrimination and harassment;
 - (iv) setting new priority indicators for 2013-17 in line with the recommendations of the Fairness Commission to prioritise areas with key outcome differentials or impacts;

- (v) mainstreaming EDI performance into the Performance Management Framework and throughout business planning;
- (vi) developing a deeper knowledge of our customers and communities including consistent monitoring / analysis of differences within communities and new profiles;
- (vii) action in line with Workforce Equality Review;
- (viii) adding additional questions in the staff survey on EDI and more work undertaken to understand and reduce differences;
- (ix) ensuring EDI is embedded in procurement and commissioning arrangements;
- (x) re-evaluating approaches to EDI in Portfolios' to ensure they are fit for purpose; and
- (xi) continuing to review EDI arrangements in line with any changes to legislation.

7.4.3 Reasons for Decision

The Council's aim is to make Sheffield a fairer place to live and work and, on an on-going basis, to meet the needs of its diverse customers. There is excellent work being undertaken across the Council in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion that will continue to make a difference to people's lives in the City.

However, alongside this work there are areas of *persistent inequality* in key areas across the Council that this report has highlighted and undermines the good work in services. These areas should be recognised as priorities and addressed differently if we are to improve outcomes for everyone across the City.

7.4.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The actions and recommendations noted are considered to be the best way to meet our Public Sector Equality Duties, to address persistent long term inequalities and to help make Sheffield a fairer and more equal place to live and work.

7.5 AGENDA ITEM 13: WYBOURN SITE DISPOSAL

- 7.5.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report containing proposals for the disposal of a site at Wybourn for residential development by Great Places Housing Association (the local stock transfer landlord) to allow for residential development consistent with the Council approved Wybourn, Arbourthorne and Manor Park (WAMP) Masterplan.

7.5.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) subject to the Secretary of State's consent and receipt of planning approval, the site identified at Appendix A be disposed of to the Great Places Housing Association as a site for the construction of 25 properties for affordable housing; and
- (b) the Director of Housing, Enterprise and Regeneration, in consultation with the Director of Property and Facilities Management, be authorised to agree terms for the disposal of the site for the purposes mentioned above, and to instruct the Director of Legal Services to complete the transfer on the terms agreed.

7.5.3 Reasons for Recommendations

Disposal of this site at Wybourn for residential development by Great Places Housing Association will allow for residential development consistent with the Council approved Wybourn, Arbourthorne and Manor Park (WAMP) Masterplan which will confer a number of timely benefits for the area and the city as a whole.

Disposal to Great Places Housing Association will result in the building of 25 new properties for affordable rent.

It will also increase the opportunity for local people to benefit from the developments and ensure that maximum numbers of options are available to the Council and Great Places Housing Association for future interventions that seek to ensure the long term sustainability of the neighbourhood.

It is intended that the development will include a variety of housing types, including apartments and bungalows, which are felt to meet the changing housing needs of local residents.

These new properties will help deliver the Council's vision for the City and people of Sheffield by increasing the provision of high quality affordable housing that supports and delivers the City Councils Corporate Plan ambitions.

Working with Great Places Housing Association will allow better investment planning for them, including the coordinated development of the sites to maximise the opportunity for local residents to move into the new properties. As the local landlord of choice and following extensive community consultation on other projects, Great Places Housing Association have detailed knowledge of the housing needs of the area and will be able to build the new housing to meet those demands.

7.5.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

Do not dispose of the site yet.

In order to maximise receipt from the potential sale of the site it has been considered whether it would be appropriate to wait until an upturn in the economy before disposal. This would however mean that the site would be left undeveloped for an indeterminable time. With no guarantee of developer interest in this site or potential best price offer.

It would also deny the opportunity to develop the site speedily and to fit with Great Places Housing Association investment plans for the neighbourhood or resident expectation for the development of the site.

The timely development of the site is also intended to raise developer confidence in the wider area which will be reflected in the viability of other potential projects.

This option would also delay the delivery of an important strategic intervention of the WAMP Masterplan.

Open market with conditions/no conditions

Although this option could potentially allow potential rapid development of the site and maximise receipt, this is improbable in the current economic downturn as we could not guarantee developer interest or potential best price offer.

If the site was sold for open market development it would reduce the opportunity for local residents to access the new housing. It would also deny opportunity for local lettings and compromise the investment strategy of Great Places Housing Association.

The process would also delay appointment of a developer and a start on site.

In addition such a process may result in establishing a new Registered Provider in the area, or if the developer chooses to work in partnership with another Registered Provider, with resultant issues around this as detailed in paragraph 7.3 of the report

Disposal of the site to another Registered Provider

This option would allow development by a Registered Provider other than the local resident's landlord of choice.

Although this would introduce a choice of landlord for residents, it may compromise the opportunity for aligning investment and maintenance strategies.

This option may also compromise the compatibility of local lettings policies to the detriment of local residents wanting to access properties at Wybourn.

Disposal of the site to Sheffield Housing Company (SHC).

This site is not on the current list of sites that has been offered to the SHC. If it were to be offered then there is no certainty as to when the site would be released and any agreed release date would be made on the SHC priorities rather than local need.

Open competition with detailed development brief.

The Council could agree a development brief and advertise the site to developers. This would allow the Council to be prescriptive and prioritise the development requirements.

It would however delay the release of the site, be Council resource intensive and not have guaranteed developer interest or potential best price offer.

It may result in the establishment of a new Registered Provider in the area which could result in difficulties in aligning investment strategies with Great Places Housing Association and a coordinated local lettings policy.

If a condition was included in the development brief that insisted the winning developer work in partnership with Great Places Housing Association then this may stop some developers entering the competition or force the developer to work with a partner it would not choose to work with. This may result in a difficult working arrangement that may be detrimental to any scheme.

7.6 AGENDA ITEM 14:FOX HILL REDEVELOPMENT

7.6.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted on the progress of work being undertaken in connection with the Fox Hill Redevelopment.

7.6.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) authorises the Director of Property and Facilities Management and the Director of Housing, Enterprise and Regeneration to negotiate any new terms of the lease as are considered necessary for the provision of good quality housing at Fox Hill;
- (b) delegates to the Cabinet Members for Homes and Neighbourhoods and Business, Skills and Development, authority to consider the developers final proposals and whether they meet the City Council's requirements and make a decision as to whether or not to proceed with those proposals; and
- (c) subject to the decision being made to proceed with the proposals, authorises the Director of Property and Facilities Management to instruct the Director of Legal Services to complete the necessary legal documentation.

7.6.3 Reasons for Recommendations

The City Council wants to ensure that a new developer is secured who can

deliver high quality housing for Fox Hill and is working with KPMG, who have been testing the market to identify developer interest.

This report requests that officers are authorised to continue with the negotiations and agree a variation of the lease to allow a new scheme of development which will still maintain the high quality standards required.

7.6.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

The City Council (CC) has been cooperating with KPMG to allow them to secure a new developer. They have carried out some extensive market testing but interest in the site with the present obligations under the lease has been weak, resulting in only one positive expression of interest.

If Artisan H Ltd remains in breach of the terms of the lease the CC could require that the lease is assigned to the CC for £1 and could seek to identify another developer. However, following the market testing already carried out, this is unlikely to result in any further interest.

In the mean time the CC would be responsible for all security and health and safety costs and no funding is available for this.

There is a reputational risk to the CC if this project is not taken forwards in a timely manner. Currently, the CC is cooperating with KPMG in order to get best value and high quality design for the site. The potential developer is willing to work at risk, but requires reassurance from the CC that we will not start negotiations with any other developer in the short term (6 months from June). This report allows officers to negotiate the best deal for the CC to allow the development to progress.

7.7 **AGENDA ITEM 15: REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2012-13**

7.7.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted the Month 2 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme for 2012/13.

7.7.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the 2012/13 budget position; and

(b) in relation to the Capital Programme:-

(i) notes the proposed additions to the capital programme listed in Appendix 1, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or Delegated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;

(ii) notes the proposed variations in Appendices 1 and 2;

- (iii) notes that there were no variations approved by Directors under their delegated authority;
- (iv) notes the Emergency Approvals in Appendix 1; and
- (v) notes the financial position on the Capital Programme.

7.7.3 Reasons for Recommendations

To formally record changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme and approve changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with latest information.

7.7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

8 LEE ADAMS, DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

- 8.1 The Chair referred to the fact that Lee Adams, Deputy Chief Executive, was attending her last Cabinet meeting, due to her forthcoming retirement and on behalf of the Cabinet, congratulated and thanked her for her contribution to the work of the Authority over the last four years and on her general contribution to public service throughout her prestigious career.