

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Cabinet

### Meeting held 9 December 2015

**PRESENT:** Councillors Leigh Bramall (Deputy Chair), Ben Curran, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea and Sioned-Mair Richards

.....

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from the Leader, Councillor Julie Dore and Councillor Terry Fox.

#### **2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

2.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

#### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

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

4.1 The minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 November 2015 were approved as a correct record.

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

##### **5.1 Public Question in respect of Public Participation**

Adam Butcher asked what the Administration was doing to make sure that the 2000 plus people who wanted to get actively involved with the political process were getting involved?

In response Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Equality, commented that one of the recommendations of the Fairness Commission was around Civic Participation. The Administration was working closely with Electoral Services to ensure that people were on the Electoral Register, particularly in the light of recent Government changes to the criteria for people to register.

Based on calculations there could be as many as 22,500 people in the City who were not registered to vote. Extra resources had been allocated to target the hard to reach groups and the Council worked with a number of organisations to try and achieve this through the Equalities Hubs. Events had been held via the Silence Breakers organisation.

The Council had tried to make being able to vote as easy as possible. People could apply for an electronic or postal vote. Polling Stations had been made as

accessible as possible to all groups and complied with disability requirements. Any suggestions on how to improve public participation were welcomed. The Council was also working closely with both universities in the City. When a student signed up to Sheffield University they were automatically put on the Electoral Register and it was hoped to extend this practice to Sheffield Hallam University and Sheffield College.

Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, added that postal votes were available for those people who could not get to the polling station and proxy votes could be used. Networks and providers known to the Council could be used to remind people of their right to vote. The Learning Disability and Mental Health Partnerships had their own networks who they regularly liaised with.

Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, further added that MENCAP had produced a series of videos and workbooks which outlined the process of how to vote and detailed information was available on their website. The Council had Local Area Partnerships who held regular meetings in the local community for people who wanted to get involved at a local level and Councillor Richards could send a list of the Chairs of the Partnerships to Mr Butcher.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing, reported that Housing+ would be rolled out next year. The aim was to reach more people, including people with learning disabilities. Something could be included in the next newsletter to tenants and Mr Butcher would be welcome to contribute to that.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, reported that there was a lot of work being done in schools based around citizenship enabling young people to understand what it meant to take part in the democratic process and how to do it.

Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, reported that Customer Services were checking whether people were on the Electoral Register when they called, such as if they called asking for information on Assisted Waste Collections.

## 5.2 Public Question in respect of Tree Replacement

Nigel Slack referred to a question he had asked at the previous meeting of Full Council with respect to the replacement of felled trees and the supposed 'like for like' policy of the Amey Streets Ahead Contract. Mr Slack commented that Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, had replied with details of the number of trees replaced, or planned for planting in this current winter. Mr Slack stated that this was interesting but the crux of his question was concerning Cemetery Avenue which had been unanswered as follows:- 'Of the 5 trees removed none had yet been replaced by new saplings, as 'like for like' requires, and yet the pavement had now been resurfaced. In addition, the other 5 trees sanctioned for removal are still in place. What is the new plan for Cemetery Avenue?' Mr Slack asked if a response was available or was there no plan yet in

place?

In the absence of Councillor Terry Fox, Simon Green, Executive Director, Place reported that the plan was as previously stated. The pavements needed to be resurfaced in the first instance and the trees would then be replanted as part of the replanting process already underway.

### 5.3 Public Question in respect of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Nigel Slack commented that the report supporting the Community Infrastructure Levy item (item number 9 on the agenda for the meeting) was for an average member of the public, opaque to say the least. Mr Slack believed this type of complex document did little to further transparency in decision making.

Mr Slack added that CIL was clearly a process that would be applied on a case by case basis and, as with many planning policies and procedures, allowed a level of flexibility in its implementation. Naturally, Mr Slack believed that as profit making companies, developers would look to exploit this flexibility, particularly on bigger developments with potentially high value CIL. Mr Slack therefore asked how will the CIL be monitored after planning approvals and will the Council ensure that any variance of CIL conditions or payments are reserved decisions of either Cabinet Members or the Planning Committee itself?

Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, responded that the previous system to CIL, in which developers would have to fulfil different obligations, often resulted in a development not being viable for the developer and this was tested by an independent assessment. This was not an ideal situation for either the Council or developers as it added an air of uncertainty. The aim of the CIL was to give certainty and assess what a reasonable contribution should be in each area of the City and the Council should know what is to be paid. There would still be planning obligations which would need to be fulfilled as part of the normal planning process. CIL should bring in more income than the previous system, so there was no sense that developers 'were getting away with it'.

### 5.4 Public Question in respect of Foreign Investment

Mr Slack commented that in response to his question, at Full Council on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2015, concerning Chinese investment in the City and that country's human rights issues, Councillor Bramall was correct in reminding him not to lump all individuals within that country together. For clarification therefore, could he ask if the Council would check the human rights credentials of any individuals or companies from China that wish to invest in the City?

Councillor Leigh Bramall responded that, following the recent Council visit to China, a partner organisation had been identified for developments in the City. An agreement for this was currently being worked on but an audit had been undertaken. More generally, developers from all over the world seek to develop in the City and this has become increasingly common as a result of globalisation. The Council did not have the resources to monitor or audit every developer in this

fashion.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Devolution Consultation

Nigel Slack asked can the Devolution consultation be on the home page of the Council's website and not just in the consultation hub as it was currently?

Councillor Bramall agreed to look into this matter.

**6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

There were no items called-in for Scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

**7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

There were no staff retirements to report.

**8. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY AND PLANNING OBLIGATIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the previous approval of Cabinet (5 April 2015) and Full Council (3 June 2015) to adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule and begin charging CIL from 15 July 2015;
- (b) notes the agreement within the above mentioned approvals for the production of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on CIL and Planning Obligations to be referred to Cabinet for subsequent approval following public consultation;
- (c) notes all representations made in respect of the SPD at both stages of the consultation process and agrees the response taken by officers; and
- (d) approves the CIL and Planning Obligations SPD to supplement the Local Plan as a material consideration in the planning process to advise applicants and assess planning applications.

8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

The Council has started to charge the CIL and this SPD is needed to provide clear and consistent guidance on the application of CIL and Planning Obligations.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

There are no alternative options appropriate, as an SPD is required to provide clarity and guidance on how CIL and Planning Obligations will be applied. Cabinet committed to the production of the SPD in April 2015.

**9. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2015/16 MONTH 7 (AS AT 31/10/15)**

9.1 The Interim Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the month 7 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2015/16.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report on the 2015/16 Revenue Budget position;
- (b) approves the carry forwards requested in paragraph 5 of the report;
- (c) approves and notes ongoing work to close the in-year Public Health gap as described in paragraph 8 of the report;
- (d) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
  - (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme, listed in Appendix 5.1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;
  - (ii) approves the proposed variations, deletions and slippages in Appendix 5.1 of the report; and notes:-
    - (A) the variations in Appendix 5.1 of the report within the delegated authority of the Council's Executive Management Team (EMT);
    - (B) one variation of £5k authorised by a Director under the delegated authority provisions; and
    - (C) the latest position on the Capital Programme.

**9.3 Reasons for Decision**

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

#### 9.4 **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.