

# Cabinet

---

**Wednesday 10 May 2017 at 2.00 pm**

**To be held at the Town Hall,  
Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

## **Membership**

---

Councillor Julie Dore	(Leader of the Council)
Councillor Olivia Blake	(Deputy Leader)
Councillor Ben Curran	(Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources)
Councillor Jackie Drayton	(Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families)
Councillor Jayne Dunn	(Cabinet Member for Housing)
Councillor Mazher Iqbal	(Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport)
Councillor Mary Lea	(Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure)
Councillor Bryan Lodge	(Cabinet Member for Environment)
Councillor Cate McDonald	(Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care)
Councillor Jack Scott	(Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries)

---

---

## **PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING**

---

The Cabinet discusses and takes decisions on the most significant issues facing the City Council. These include issues about the direction of the Council, its policies and strategies, as well as city-wide decisions and those which affect more than one Council service. Meetings are chaired by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at [www.sheffield.gov.uk](http://www.sheffield.gov.uk). You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked \* on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Cabinet meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Cabinet meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Cabinet may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

Cabinet decisions are effective six working days after the meeting has taken place, unless called-in for scrutiny by the relevant Scrutiny Committee or referred to the City Council meeting, in which case the matter is normally resolved within the monthly cycle of meetings.

If you require any further information please contact Simon Hughes on 0114 273 4014 or email [simon.hughes@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:simon.hughes@sheffield.gov.uk).

---

## **FACILITIES**

---

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

---

**CABINET AGENDA  
10 MAY 2017**

**Order of Business**

---

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**  
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest** (Pages 1 - 4)  
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meeting** (Pages 5 - 16)  
To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19 April 2017.
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**  
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Items Called-In For Scrutiny**  
The Director of Legal and Governance will inform the Cabinet of any items called in for scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet
- 8. Retirement of Staff** (Pages 17 - 20)  
Report of the Director of Legal and Governance
- 9. Developing Services for Children, Young People and Families in Sheffield - Reviewing our Model for Children's Centre Areas** (Pages 21 - 42)  
Report of the Executive Director, People Services
- 10. Month 12 Capital Approvals** (Pages 43 - 52)  
Report of the Acting Executive Director, Resources

**NOTE: The next meeting of Cabinet will be held on Wednesday 14 June 2017 at 2.00 pm**

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

---

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period\* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

\*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
  - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
  - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
  - the landlord is your council or authority; and
  - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
  - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
  - (b) either -
    - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
    - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Audit and Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email [gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet

Meeting held 19 April 2017

**PRESENT:** Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Bryan Lodge, Cate McDonald and Jack Scott

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mary Lea.

**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 Councillor Olivia Blake declared a personal interest in agenda item 10 'Month 11 Capital Approvals' as a Trustee of Sheffield Museums and Galleries.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 15 March 2017 were approved as a correct record.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 Public Question in respect of Streets Ahead Contract and Traffic Regulation Orders

5.1.1 Nigel Slack commented that, whilst still awaiting further information on the Streets Ahead contract and the impact on vulnerable people of works within this contract, he noted that the last attempt by the Council to prevent peaceful protest seemed again to flaunt any care for vulnerable people affected by these 'Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders.'

5.1.2 Mr Slack therefore asked what procedures were in place for the access of emergency vehicles, health visitors, care workers, relatives and delivery drivers, to name but a few, to the properties of vulnerable people on the roads affected?

5.1.3 Mr Slack added that the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 – Section 3.1 prevented the regulations being used to the effect of "preventing at any time access for pedestrians." How did this square with the recent use of safety barriers across the full width of roads where tree felling was taking place? How will residents on Brookfield Road and Dobcroft Close access their properties?

5.1.4 Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for the Environment, responded that

access should be maintained at all times and if someone felt this was not the case they should speak to the operatives and they would be let through. This was also the case with emergency vehicles.

5.1.5 The Traffic Regulation Orders referred to had been used since 2012 and access for those referred to by Mr Slack had always been maintained. In fact, the Council had received a number of thank you letters for the conduct of Amey and the operatives.

5.1.6 The Council had resurfaced 1244 miles, which was further than from Sheffield to Oslo of pavements and 605 miles, which was just short of from Sheffield to Frankfurt, of roads, so the situation was nothing new. Emergency vehicles were always allowed access and if residents contacted Streets Ahead with specific requests they would do everything that they could to help.

## 5.2 Public Question in respect of Survey Results

5.2.1 Nigel Slack commented that, in the statement on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2017, with respect to the household survey data for the Streets Ahead contract and street trees, the Council stated "Our household surveys show that only a small percentage of residents disagree with our proposals for tree replacement and that the vast majority are supportive or indifferent." Will the Council explain where that twisted logic came from and how the raw data supports that statement?

5.2.2 Mr Slack added that perhaps we should apply similar logic to the Walkley branch Labour Party meetings results on the motion calling for the resignation of the relevant Cabinet Member? 13 votes to retain the Cabinet Member, 8 votes to remove, 10 abstentions and around 500 indifferent. Under current Council logic isn't that a vast majority supporting the resignation of the Cabinet Member?

5.2.3 Councillor Bryan Lodge commented that the votes of the Walkley branch of the Labour Party were a matter for them and as such the question should be referred to them.

## 5.3 Public Question in respect of the Outline Business Case for the Streets Ahead Contract

5.3.1 Nigel Slack asked in light of the Council's new willingness to share raw data, will they now publish the raw data from which the 'Outline Business Case' for the Streets Ahead contract was derived.

5.3.2 In response, Councillor Bryan Lodge commented that the Outline Business Case was shared and available to read. Councillor Lodge was not clear what the raw data was that Mr Slack referred to.

5.3.3 Sheffield had long been branded the 'Pothole City' which showed that residents were clearly dissatisfied with the condition of the roads. As a result, the Council initially applied for Pathfinder Status and was granted this. This then led to the Streets Ahead contract and all this information was available to read.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Trees on Ecclesall Road

5.4.1 Nigel Slack commented that, after the debacle of the last Full Council meeting, from which nobody came out smelling of roses, he assumed that it was full steam ahead on plans to fell trees on Ecclesall Road. Bearing in mind the Cabinet Member's previous comments about discriminatory trees, will the Council also be making arrangements to remove other discriminatory obstructions on this road, including bus stops, litter bins, telephone boxes, cable cabinets, bollards etc. where, in many places, these obstacles restrict the pavement width to less than the statutory minimum 1.5m or 1m that had been commented on?

5.4.2 Councillor Bryan Lodge stated that he was not present at the last Full Council meeting so could not comment on that. The proposals for trees on Ecclesall Road were currently with the Independent Tree Panel for consideration, so it was not necessarily 'full steam ahead' as Mr Slack believed. The reasons for the need for tree replacement would be numerous. Where any restrictions were in place, such as 'A Boards', the Council would remove where they were made aware of them.

5.4.3 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, added that, in relation to the issue of the last Full Council meeting, she believed that she always showed respect to others in the Council Chamber. At that meeting, a Member of the Council made a defamatory and offensive remark about Councillor Lodge. Councillor Dore had given the Member concerned the opportunity to provide evidence to support the remark and the Member did not have any evidence. In Councillor Dore's view this was therefore showing disrespect, not only to Councillor Lodge, but also to the Chair of the meeting, the Lord Mayor.

5.4.4 Councillor Dore added that the Lord Mayor was in charge of the meeting and if a Member refused to abide by the code and spirit of the Member Code of Conduct and was allowed to do this, this would give license for any Member to say what they wanted in the Chamber without recourse.

5.4.5 Councillor Dore believed the behaviour shown also disrespected the petitioner who had not yet received a full response to their petition before opposition Members left the Chamber. The response would have been, as stated by Councillor Lodge, that the Independent Tree Panel was currently looking at the trees on Ecclesall Road.

5.4.6 Councillor Dore apologised for the events at the last Full Council meeting, but would not accept that the Administration had any part to play in the events that occurred and hoped that it did not happen again.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Streets Ahead Contract

5.5.1 Nigel Slack asked why was analysis of the roadways substrates not part of the Streets Ahead Contract?

5.5.2 Councillor Bryan Lodge replied that the extent of the resurfacing works had been discussed in detail with the Government. It was a maintenance rather than a reconstruction contract and reconstruction would have been much more disruptive to residents than the current contract.

5.5.3 The Carillion bid had been for substantially less work than the Council had achieved with Amey. Some of the problems, such as infield utility trenches, Amey had to resolve at no cost to the Council. The Council was continually trying to reduce any disruption caused to residents.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Streets Ahead Contract

5.6.1 Nigel Slack commented that, in his opinion, the Streets Ahead contract was poorly drafted, probably by Amey, poorly understood by everyone but Amey and poorly managed by Amey and the Council. When will the cumulative effect of the problems being caused and the internal pressures from the Labour Party convince the Council that a root and branch review was needed?

5.6.2 Councillor Bryan Lodge commented that he disagreed with Mr Slack's view of the Streets Ahead contract. It had been drafted by the Council, in consultation with the Government, based on a Private Finance Initiative Model contract.

**6. ITEMS FROM SCRUTINY**

6.1 The Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee submitted a report outlining in depth work undertaken around hate crime. This was done through a cross party Task Group. The work focussed on the reporting of hate crime and the report submitted was the final report of the Task Group.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) thanks the Safer & Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee for its work on hate crime;
- (b) notes the Hate Crime Task Group Report attached as Appendix A to the report;
- (c) agrees that an initial joint response from the Cabinet Members for Community Services and Libraries, Housing, and Children, Young People & Families is provided to the Safer & Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee's July 2017 meeting; and
- (d) agrees that a further report to the Safer & Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on progress on implementing the Task Group's recommendations be provided to the Committee by December 2017.

6.3 **Reasons for Decision**

6.3.1 In order to make it clear to the Scrutiny Committee what actions the Council is committing to, the Committee requests a joint response report to its Hate Crime Task Group Report.

6.3.2 To enable the Committee to scrutinise progress made in implementing the

recommendations, the Committee requests a further report back on implementation.

#### 6.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

6.4.1 An alternative option in relation to the recommendations would be to do nothing with the Task Group Report. However, given the time and effort spent by the Task Group and contributions to the work from external organisations, this is not deemed a viable option.

6.4.2 An alternative option in relation to the recommendations would be to respond to the Committee's report over a much longer timescale. However, the Scrutiny Committee would welcome a fast response to its recommendations. The Committee believes a report to its July 2017 meeting strikes an appropriate balance between speed and allowing sufficient time for Cabinet Members and officers to consider the recommendations in the Hate Crime Task Group report.

### 7. **RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

7.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

**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>
<b><u>Children, Young People and Families</u></b>		
Claire Blundell	Residential Homes Manager	29
Valerie Higgins	Administrator/Finance Manager, Nether Green Infant School	23
Paula Robinson	Senior Youth Prevention Worker	22
<b><u>Communities</u></b>		
Brian Coddington	Contracts Officer	45
Stephen Johnson	Archives and Heritage Officer	23
Marie Ledger	Business Support Manager	24
Stewart Merrill	Senior Housing Solutions	34

	Officer	
Robert Pinder	Approved Mental Health Practitioner	36
<b><u>Place</u></b>		
Mark Claypole	Maintenance Operative, Sheffield Markets	29
David Cooper	Head of Policy and Projects, Culture and Environment	38
Daryl Dawson	Area Officer, Parks and Countryside	38
Patrick Holt	Maintenance Operative, Sheffield Markets	39
Martin Kirwan	Technician, Highway Development Control	20
Mark Lowe	District Parks Officer	40
Ivor Powell	Maintenance Operative, Sheffield Markets	35
Trevor Sullivan	Principal Planning Officer	28
<b><u>Resources</u></b>		
Stephen Adams	Facilities Manager	31
Titu Hayre-Bennett	Human Resources Business Partner	31

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

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

## **8. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE POST 16 TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT POLICY**

8.1 The Executive Director, People submitted a report in relation to proposed changes to the Post 16 travel and transport policy:-

- to report back on the proposals following a thorough consultation with all affected users, alongside schools and colleges, between 30 January and 24 March 2017; and

- to highlight a number of recommended changes to the Post 16 travel and transport policy from the findings of the consultation, to Cabinet, for their endorsement.

The report also included the questionnaires that went out to affected families, a detailed analysis of the consultation, and the findings from the consultation.

**8.2 RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Council ceases to provide the discretionary zero fare bus pass for post 16 students with effect from 1 September 2017 and instead request that families who are eligible apply for and use the 16 - 19 Bursary fund to pay for transport and the Council shall continue to work alongside schools and colleges to offer the necessary support to any families or young people who need help with the application process in order that they are able to access the bursary;
- (b) completely free post 16 Special Educational Needs transport be ceased to be provided; whilst not asking families to pay the full cost of Special Educational Needs transport, it is proposed to ask all families for a contribution of £540 per year regardless of the location of their education provision (the weekly cost over the year would be £10.38); a variety of payment options to meet families' needs will be available and families who are eligible for either the vulnerable or discretionary bursary will be expected to apply and use this fund towards the cost of transport;
- (c) the Council continues to support Independent Travel Training and to ensure that it remains a central part of the post 16 travel and transport policy to ensure that as many students who are able, travel independently to and from their place of education and training in order to maximise their independence, lifelong learning and employment prospects;
- (d) a hardship fund be created and administered in order to mitigate the impact on those families with students in post 16 education who may be significantly affected by these proposals; those who could access the fund may include:
  - Families with siblings attending post 16 education at the same time, who are both on Special Educational Needs transport
  - Low wage working families who have children on Special Educational Needs post 16 transport
  - Young people who are mid-way through their course at 1 September 2017, for whom the changes will have a negative impact on their studies; and
- (e) the policy changes be implemented from 1st September 2017 and the Executive Director, People be authorised to implement these recommendations.

### 8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 8.3.1 That the Council should cease to provide the discretionary zero fare bus pass for post 16 students with effect from 1/9/2017 and instead request that families who are eligible apply for and use the 16- 19 Bursary fund to pay for transport. The Council will continue to work alongside schools and colleges to offer the necessary support to any families or young people who need help with the application process in order that they are able to access the bursary.

The 16-19 Bursary Fund is to help with education-related costs for students aged 16 to 19 and travel is a key element of education-related costs. Government guidance states that: Local authorities may take receipt of 16-19 bursary funding into account in assessing an individual's need for financial help with transport (see statutory duties outlined in paragraph 1.3 of the report).

Whilst it is recognised that the bursary has been used by students in a variety of ways, it remains an appropriate fund for the Council to take into consideration when providing travel assistance (see statutory duties (paragraph 1.3). As noted in paragraph 1.1.1 of the report, all other identified authorities are using their right to take bursary funding into consideration and as such do not automatically provide zero fare bus passes to students in receipt of the bursary.

In addition, as a Local Authority, Sheffield City Council ensures that post 16 students are able to travel at a reduced rate on public transport (currently 80p per journey on buses within Sheffield) with its reduced bus fare scheme via the funding the Council contributes to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.

Taking all the consultation responses into account, the Council believe that we should come into alignment with other authorities and cease to provide a discretionary zero fare bus pass for post 16 students. However, the consultation has raised potential issues which we have sought to mitigate (see section 6.5 of the report).

The Council will work with schools and colleges throughout the summer term 2017 to ensure that students who are eligible have all the information and support that they need to apply for the bursary. Following any policy change, the Council, across all relevant services, will continue to offer the necessary support to any families or young people who need help with the application process in order that they are able to access the bursary.

Other responses from parents included concerns that students in post 16 education should not be given money and should instead be given a bus pass. We recognise parents' concerns and there is an option for families to purchase bus passes from South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive if this best suits their family's needs.

- 8.3.2 To cease to provide completely free post 16 Special Educational Needs transport. Whilst not asking families to pay the full cost of Special Educational Needs transport, it is proposed to ask all families for a contribution of £540 per year regardless of the location of their education provision (The weekly cost over the



year would be £10.38). A variety of payment options to meet family's needs will be available. Families who are eligible for either the vulnerable or discretionary bursary will be expected to apply and use this fund towards the cost of transport.

Sheffield City Council is committed to providing Special Educational Needs transport for eligible post 16 students in order to facilitate their attendance at school/college. Whilst recommending that families pay a contribution of £540 per year, we acknowledge the need for these payments to be able to be made in a variety of ways, monthly, termly or annually, and will ensure that a range of payment options are available for families.

It is proposed that students who are eligible use the 16-19 Bursary Fund to pay the contribution of £540 for Special Education Needs post 16 transport. 87% of respondents stated that it would be a good idea for this contribution to be deducted at source. It is therefore proposed that the Council works with schools so that, if possible, students who access the discretionary bursary via the Council's administrative function have the cost of transport removed before any remainder funds are given to families.

As noted in paragraph 6.1 of the report, the Council will work with schools and colleges throughout the summer term 2017 to ensure that students who are eligible have all the information and support that they need to apply for the bursary. Upon implementation of any policy change, the Council, across all relevant services, will continue to offer the necessary support to any families or young people who need help with the application process in order that they are able to access the bursary.

- 8.3.3 To continue to support Independent Travel Training and to ensure that it remains a central part of the post 16 travel and transport policy. To ensure that as many students who are able, travel independently to and from their place of education and training in order to maximise their independence, lifelong learning and employment prospects.

Sheffield City Council recognises the life changing and life enhancing impact of all levels of independent travel and will continue to provide a free travel training programme for all of those who are deemed suitable. In order to support children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities to live happy, healthy and fulfilling lives, our travel training offer extends not just to those who can reach full independence but also to facilitate the maximum level of independence each child and young person can accomplish.

- 8.3.4 To create and administer a hardship fund in order to mitigate the impact on those families with students in post 16 education who may be significantly affected by these proposals. Those who could access the fund may include:

- Families with siblings attending post 16 education at the same time, who are both on Special Educational Needs transport
- Low wage working families who have children on Special Educational Needs post 16 transport
- Young people who are mid-way through their course on 1st September 2017, for

whom the changes will have a negative impact on their studies.

As noted throughout this Cabinet report, the Council is committed to ensuring that all Sheffield children and young people are able to reach their full potential, and it is determined to ensure that this change in policy enables students to access education. This hardship fund will take into consideration the individual family circumstances, and will be dealt with on a case by case basis.

It is proposed that the hardship fund will also be used to ensure that young people who will be mid-way through their course on 1st September 2017, for whom the changes will have a negative impact on their studies, are able to access this fund if necessary to ensure their continued attendance. This will be dealt with by officers upon a family's request on an individual basis. The hardship fund will also be available for students if there is a funding gap between their bursary and the cost of a student's travel.

We do not know how many students may need support from the hardship fund who are currently mid-way through their post 16 education, as we have not historically asked students to fund their fare in this way (see section 4.2 of the report).

8.3.5 To publish the changed policy by 31 May and to implement the policy changes from 1st September 2017. To delegate authority to the Executive Director, People to implement these recommendations

There is a duty on local authorities to publish an annual Post 16 Transport Policy Statement (see section 1.5 of the report). The deadline for this is 31 May each year. Sheffield City Council has made the decision to implement these changes later than many other local authorities, including our neighbouring authorities. It is proposed that these changes are introduced in September 2017.

Finally, we would like to thank all those families, schools, colleges and voluntary sector organisations who took the time to give us their views and suggestions, which in turn have helped to shape our proposals.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

8.4.1 Sheffield City Council has maintained discretionary provision regarding its post 16 travel policy for longer than neighbouring authorities. One option was to continue with this provision, however in light of continuing and extensive budget cuts this option was no longer considered sustainable.

8.4.2 For those whose child is educated outside of South Yorkshire, the contribution that we would be asking families to pay is £700 (£13.46 per week). This reflects the increased equivalent public transport cost.

The Council considered all the initial proposals which were sent out to families, but in order to decrease inequalities and ensure that no young people were detrimentally disadvantaged, the proposal to charge families £700 for travelling outside of South Yorkshire was rejected.

**9. COMMISSIONING OF HOME CARE AND SUPPORTED LIVING FOR ADULTS WITH SOCIAL CARE NEEDS**

9.1 The Executive Director, People submitted a report highlighting the importance of good quality Homecare and Supported Living to many of Sheffield's most vulnerable residents and seeking authority to proceed with the procurement of Home Care and Supported Living services and subsequent awarding of contracts.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes plans to ensure that both Homecare and Supported Living are commissioned to provide positive outcomes and sustainable quality at best value for the people of Sheffield;
- (b) approves the procurement strategy outlined in the report;
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Adult Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to award the contracts for Home Care and Supported Living; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Director of Adult Services, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, as appropriate, to take all other necessary steps not covered by existing delegations to achieve the outcomes outlined in the report.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 Nationally the Home Care market is fragile and some major national Home Care providers are leaving the market – particularly in the north of England. Home Care providers are citing low fees, difficult trading conditions, and challenges with recruitment as the primary reasons for their exit. However, Sheffield City Council has offered increased rates for homecare providers in 2017-18 and all but two of 29 providers have accepted these rates. This provides a stronger foundation for the development of homecare in Sheffield than has been in place in recent years.

9.3.2 If quality and supply of Home Care and Supported Living are not sustainable there are obviously direct consequences for Sheffield's citizens. This is not only in relation to poor customer experience. For example, insufficient homecare supply can result in older people staying in hospital longer than they need to, creating significant pressures for others around access to emergency treatment and also risking worse longer term outcomes for themselves.

9.3.3 There are clear standards for practice in this area which will help deliver services of a sustainable quality. Some have a cost implication but others can be delivered through improved commissioning practice including more collaborative and supportive market relationships. For example, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) published national guidance on Homecare Standards in

June 2016. UNISON's Ethical Homecare Charter provides a framework for improving quality. The principles within both the NICE guidance and the Ethical Homecare Charter will be contained within the Council's proposed approach to procurement.

#### 9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 9.4.1 Discontinuing support in these areas is not an option. These services are required to fulfil the Council's functions and duties under the Care Act 2014.

### 10. **MONTH 11 CAPITAL APPROVALS**

- 10.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 11, 2016/17.

- 10.2 **RESOLVED:** That the proposed variations, slippage and additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report be approved, including the procurement strategies, and authority be delegated to the Director of Commercial Services to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group.

#### 10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 To record formally changes to 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.

#### 10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 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 Capital Programme.

# Agenda Item 8



**Author/Lead Officer of Report:**  
Simon Hughes/Principal Committee Secretary

**Tel:** 27 34014

**Report of:** *Acting Executive Director, Resources*

**Report to:** *Cabinet*

**Date of Decision:** *10 May 2017*

**Subject:** *Staff Retirements*

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? <i>N/A</i>		
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? <i>N/A</i>		
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? <i>(Insert reference number)</i>		
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-		

**Purpose of Report:**

To report the retirement of the following staff from the Council's Service and to convey the Council's thanks for their work.

**Recommendations:**

To recommend that Cabinet:-

- (a) place on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the City Council by the above-mentioned members of staff in the Portfolios stated;
- (b) extend to them its best wishes for the future and a long and happy retirement; and
- (c) direct that an appropriate extract of the resolution now made under the Common Seal of the Council be forwarded to those staff above with over 20 years' service.

**Background Papers: None**

*(Insert details of any background papers used in the compilation of the report.)*

**1. PROPOSAL**

1.1 To report the retirement of the following staff from the Council's Service and to convey the Council's thanks for their work:-

<b><u>People Services</u></b>		<b><u>Years' Service</u></b>
Debbie Barker	Teacher, Lydgate Infant School	20
Lynette Atkin	Admin/Finance Officer, St Thomas More Catholic Primary School	23

This page is intentionally left blank





**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Nicola Shearstone, Acting Assistant Director, Jackie Robinson, Service Manager EIP service.  
**Tel:** 27 34041 / 20 57331

**Report of:** Executive Director, Children Young people and Families

**Report to:** Cabinet

**Date of Decision:** 10 May 2017

**Subject:** Developing Services for Children, Young People and Families in Sheffield – Reviewing our model for Children’s Centre Areas.

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:- Yes  No

- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000

- Affects 2 or more Wards

Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to?  
Children & Young People

Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to?  
Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? Yes  No

If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given?  
EIA1220

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes  No

If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-

**Purpose of Report:**

This paper reports back on the Children's Centre consultation between 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016 and 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017 and recommends proposals to develop a new delivery model for Children's Centre areas into Family Centre areas which:

- Are for pre-birth – 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has special educational needs or disabilities);
- Are located in the 20% most deprived areas of the City within 7 locality areas; and
- Provide services across Sheffield from link and outreach sites, including community venues and in the home.

**Recommendations:**

This Family Centre Locality Model builds on the existing strengths, expertise and current infrastructure of Children's Centres and confirms our commitment to Early Years and the importance of high quality, flexible and accessible services for the very youngest.

Therefore we recommend that Cabinet approves:

- a new service delivery model based on dividing the city into 7 geographical locality areas, each area will include a main centre and linked centres or other community outreach sites for service delivery across the locality;
- an extension of the age range from pre-birth to 5 to pre-birth to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has special educational needs or disabilities); and
- that the 7 Family Centre main sites named in the report to be the designated Children's Centres addresses in order to meet a statutory duty to ensure provision of sufficient Children's Centres in the Local Authority's area, whilst noting that such designation will result in all services pre-birth - 5 in the whole Family Centre locality being regulated and inspected by Ofsted under the current inspection framework for Children's Centres.
- that services will be delivered in main and linked centres and outreach venues across the locality. They will run at various times and days and with core and extra services provided by a range of agencies at a variety of venues. Those services could include clinics, groups, drop-in and timetabled sessions.
- to continue the current governance model of multi-agency partnership boards in each area which will support the assessment of need across the locality to ensure services meet the needs of families when and where they are required.

**Background Papers:** Early Help Strategy; Best Start Strategy

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: Andy Bray
		Legal: Louise Bate
		Equalities: Bashir Khan
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b>	Jayne Ludlam
3	<b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b>	Councillor Jackie Drayton
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Nicola Shearstone Jackie Robinson	<b>Job Title:</b> Acting Assistant Director for EIP Service Manager WEST MAST
	<b>Date:</b>	

## **1. PROPOSAL**

### **Proposed Family Centre Areas**

#### **1.1 Background**

Our vision for Sheffield is for every child, young person and family to achieve their full potential, to recognise their strengths and to be supported to build capacity and resilience resulting in sustained independence now and in the future in spite of any disadvantages they may face.

Early help and prevention, identifying needs and providing support when they first appear at any point in a child, young person or family's journey is key to delivering this vision. Fundamental to the method is a whole household approach which acknowledges that a problem for one person in the family cannot be isolated from affecting other family members.

It is proposed that across the city, families of children pre-birth to 19 years (0 – 25 years if the young person has special educational needs or disabilities ("SEND")) will continue to have access to the full range of early help services either delivered on site, through outreach in suitable community venues or in the family home. This proposal will support the work currently taking place with a range of partners to further develop an Early Help model for the city and will enhance the ability to deliver against the Best Start Strategy.

The Local Authority has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient Children's Centres in its area. It is proposed that the 7 main Family Centres are designated as Children's Centre main addresses in order to comply with the statutory duty. As a result, the centre areas will be inspected under the current Ofsted inspection framework for services for families with children in the pre-birth to five years old age range. The Family Centres will become the main address for Children's Centre Ofsted inspection purposes. Each of the 7 locality areas that link to these sites will be inspected under the Ofsted inspection framework in the future; with particular focus being given to the services provided to families within each locality rather than the Family Centre buildings themselves.

## 1.2 The Proposed Model

City divided into 7 geographical areas the map at appendix 1 shows the localities.

The proposed model is based on the rationale of a main Family Centre area with the lead building address based in the 20% most disadvantaged areas of the City with linked sites and outreach venues delivering services to families across the areas. This will ensure city wide coverage utilising a range of venues to include GP surgeries and community buildings where they are needed.

The proposal takes into consideration the outcome of the consultation.

Based on the data used and the outcome of the consultation, it is proposed that within the 7 Family Centre areas the lead centres, which will be the main address for Ofsted purposes are:

### Localities

- A. Early Days
- B. First start (Firth Park)
- C. Darnall
- D. Shortbrook
- E. Valley Park
- F. Sharrow
- G. Primrose

The following sites will be linked sites:

- A. Angram Bank
- B. Burngreave + The Meadow
- C. Brightside + Wybourn
- D. Woodthorpe
- E. Chancet Wood
- G. Shooters Grove + Stocksbridge

We are also looking into the potential of developing an additional Area E link site in the Bankwood / Heeley Green area.

There will also be outreach sessions across the 7 areas in a range of venues where they are needed.

The tables below describe proposals and rationale for each of the 7 localities.

### Locality A Parson Cross / Ecclesfield

Current Centres in Locality	Proposal	Rationale
Early Days	Develop Early days as the main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes	50% of under 5's in locality A live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs* in the country according to IDACI**
Angram Bank	Angram Bank will be a linked site.  Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality	78% of children (1584) live in the 20% most deprived LSOA in the current Early Days reach area  12% of children (184) live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the current Angram Bank reach area

### Locality B Shiregreen / Burngreave

Current Centres in Locality	Proposal	Rationale
First Start	Develop First Start as the main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes	86% of under 5's in locality B live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI
Burngreave and Meadow	Burngreave and The Meadow will be linked sites  Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality	100% of children (1095) in the First Start reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI  76% of children (1656) in the Burngreave reach area live in the 20% most deprived % LSOAs in the country according to IDACI

### Locality C Arbourthorne / Manor / Darnall / Tinsley

Current Centres in Locality	Proposal	Rationale
Darnall	Develop Darnall as the main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes	66% of under 5's in locality C live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI
Wybourn and Brightside	Wybourn and Brightside will be linked sites  Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality	83% (2260) of children in the Darnall reach area and 81% (1386) of children in the Wybourn reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI

### Locality D Mosborough / Handsworth

Current Centres in Locality	Proposal	Rationale
Shortbrook	Develop Shortbrook as the main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes	14% of under 5's in locality D live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI
Woodthorpe	Woodthorpe will be a link site. Consideration will be taken to identifying a main site in the Woodthorpe area during 2017/18  Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality	3% of children (92) in the Shortbrook reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI  31% of children (630) in the Woodthorpe reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI.  However, plans for the existing building mean that it would not be possible to name this as the main Family Centre address

**Locality E Greenhill / Gleadless Valley**

<b>Current Centres in Locality</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<p>Valley Park</p> <p>Chancet Wood</p>	<p>Develop Valley Park as a Main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes</p> <p>Chancet Wood will be a link site</p> <p>Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality</p> <p>We are looking into the potential to develop a link site in the more deprived lower end of Gleadless Valley i.e. Bankwood, Heeley Green and Lowedges Batemoor, Jordanthorpe</p>	<p>43% (1623) of children in the locality E live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI.</p> <p>46% of children (911) in the Valley Park reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI</p> <p>The Valley Park CC building is situated at the top of the Gleadless Valley with the most deprived LSOAs are in the lower end of Gleadless Valley, Bankwood and Heeley Green</p> <p>40% of children (712) in the Chancet Wood reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI</p> <p>However the most deprived children live in Lowedges, Batemoor &amp; Jordanthorpe</p>



### Locality F Rivelin / Sheaf

Current Centres in Locality	Proposal	Rationale
Sharrow	<p>Develop Sharrow as a main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes.</p> <p>Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality</p>	24% (576) of under 5s in Sharrow are in the 20% most deprived in the country according to IDACI.

### Locality G Hillsborough / Upper Don

Current Centres in Locality	Proposal	Rationale
Primrose	<p>Develop Primrose as a main Family Centre address for Ofsted purposes</p> <p>It is recognised that there is a level of deprivation in the Winn Garden, Liberty Hill and Wisewood area.</p>	<p>8% (622) of children in the locality F live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI.</p> <p>8% of children (433) in the Primrose part of the reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI.</p>
Shooters Grove And Stocksbridge	<p>Shooters Grove and Stocksbridge linked sites</p> <p>Outreach services to be delivered in community venues across the locality</p>	<p>However this is masked as Primrose reach area covers Ecclesall</p> <p>9% of children (189) in the Shooters Grove reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI</p> <p>0% of children (0) in the Stocksbridge reach area live in the 20% most deprived LSOAs in the country according to IDACI.</p>

\* LSOA = lower layer super output area (a geographic hierarchy designed to improve the reporting of small area statistics in England and Wales)

\*\* IDACI = income deprivation affecting children index (which measures in a local area the proportion of children under the age of 16 that live in low income households). It is supplementary to the [Indices of Multiple Deprivation](#) and is used for calculation of the [contextual value added](#) score, measuring children's educational progress)

## 2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

2.1 Greater integration of locally based services is key in supporting those who are most vulnerable. Sheffield is committed to enabling and supporting all of its children, young people and families to be safe, healthy and successful. We can best do this by identifying any additional needs as early as possible and by providing support at the right time and in the right place.

In Sheffield we want:

- Every child and young person is healthy, with good mental health and emotional wellbeing;
- Every child and young person achieves the education, training and skills and resilience to gain employment and independence;
- Early identification and assessment of needs will help people to get the support that they need and which they feel is right for them;
- Improved access to local services across the city;
- Support for all families so they can provide a stable, nurturing, safe and loving environment for children and young people,;
- Children, young people and families are engaged in shaping the services in their communities; and
- All staff are supported to develop their skills and knowledge and to share their expertise.

2.2 The new proposed Family Centre Areas delivery model and way of working builds on the principle of early help and prevention and focuses on making interventions at an early stage once problems have begun but before they escalate.

The Family Centre proposal builds on the existing strengths, expertise and current infrastructure of Children's Centres and confirms our commitment to Early Years and the importance of high quality, flexible and accessible services for the very youngest. It will join together and coordinate services around children and families with an extended remit from pre- birth to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has SEND). It recognises the critical role that Children's Centres have played in prevention and early intervention services and will join together and coordinate services offering community universal, targeted and specialist services.

This model is a networked locality model based on the achievement of common outcomes. The proposal is that in the seven localities there will be a lead centre acting as a base for a full range of integrated services. To ensure compliance with children's centres statutory duty, the lead centre will be inspected under the current Children's Centre Ofsted Inspection framework in relation to services for children and families pre-birth to five years old. There will be linked sites and outreach sessions delivered from community venues in localities offering clinics, groups and drop in services.

### **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

The council has a statutory duty, as set out in the Childcare Act 2006, to undertake consultation in relation to any proposed change to Children's Centres.

On the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016 a report was approved at Cabinet to allow statutory consultation to take place on a proposal to re-model the Children's Centres in Sheffield.

#### **3.1** The consultation was launched on 1 November 2016 and ran until 31 January 2017.

The consultation closed on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2017. Analysis of the consultation responses indicates a positive response to the proposal. The consultation helped the Council understand children's; young people's and families' needs and concerns in each locality.

The questionnaire findings and other comments and suggestions have been used to inform the final proposal put before the Cabinet. This information including feedback from the consultation with the public and with professionals will be used in the development of the new way of working.

The findings of the consultation will be made available online, in Children's Centres and through social media.

The Council followed the Sure Start Children's Centres statutory guidance April 2013 in preparing consultation, which was designed to seek the views of the people who may be affected most by the proposals. These included:

- Parents and carers/expectant parents and carers
- Local Communities
- Children's Centre staff and stakeholder forum members
- Statutory partners and stakeholders
- Voluntary and community sector organisations

The following actions were taken to ensure all communities were aware and able to access the consultation:

- Information about the consultation and the questionnaire were published online on Sheffield City Council's consultation website Citizen Space on 1 November and remained online throughout the 90 day consultation period.
- Further help and information was available via a phone line or email. This offer was translated into 8 community languages.
- An easy read consultation questionnaire was developed for use where necessary.
- Children's Centres were asked to direct families to the consultation website in

the first instance but were also given a supply of paper copies of the information and the questionnaire for use if families were not able to access the online version. Flyers and posters detailing drop ins and the website address were also supplied.

- 24 drop in sessions were held across the city, mainly during November and December 2016. These were held across the city, including a city centre venue. Some of these were held in an evening to ensure anyone unable to attend during the day still had the opportunity to obtain further information.
- Children's Centres promoted the consultation in all activities throughout the period within the centre itself and in the local area.
- There were regular articles in the Parents Assembly Bulletin and on social media. The Children's Centre Facebook page and website also had a link to the consultation webpage and the timetable of events.
- The Sheffield Star ran 2 articles during the consultation period with a link to the questionnaire and Radio Hallam advertised it on their hourly news bulletin in December 2016.
- Partner organisations, schools and childcare providers were briefed on the consultation and asked to promote this, encouraging their clients to take part in the consultation/attend drop in sessions.

### 3.2 **Outcome of the consultation** (see appendix 2)

#### *Breadth of response*

A total of 616 questionnaires were received and recorded on Citizen Space. Those taking part were asked which centre they currently use to assess whether there was a clear spread of respondents. Approximately 21% did not use a Children's Centre but within the remaining 78% all centres were represented.

There was a wide range of services that respondents said they utilise including midwifery, health visiting, toddler groups, training opportunities and advice services.

Approximately 21% of respondents did not feel that they currently used Children's Centre services.

Of those that supplied information, 20% stated that they were from an ethnic background other than white British. The majority of respondents were female (90%) and the majority (53%) were in the age bracket of 25 – 34 years. 7% reported that they had a disability and 9% that their child had a disability.

#### *Availability of services*

Respondents were asked what was important to them in accessing services. The following areas were felt to be the most important:

- To support their own and their child's health and wellbeing
- To meet other parents/children and develop support networks
- To support knowledge and understanding of child development

- To access support and advice during pregnancy including having a baby and parenting classes

To support access to adult learning, training and employment was seen as the least important reason to access services.

### *Change of location*

The questionnaire asked what families would do if the services moved location. Of those that answered the question 81% stated that they would either move to the new location or to the location nearest to them. 13% said that they would find an alternative way of meeting their needs. 30% of responders chose not to answer this question.

When asked if they received services in other places already, 37% of those that answered this question access services for under 5s at GP surgeries/clinics and 21% at local libraries.

The comments received indicated that the distance they would need to travel would be the influencing factor and services local and close to home were important often because of the difficulty of using public transport. However easy access by public transport was considered by some and many that commented said they would be willing to consider travel and that they often already do.

It was clear from the variety of alternative venues identified that many families already access services at outreach within their local area, perhaps without realising it.

### *Family Centres*

When asked their views on extending services to pre-birth to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has SEND) providing support for the whole family 74% agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal. Only 13% either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

When asked what type of support would benefit them as a family, those that answered the question said that the most important were:

- Supporting with physical health & wellbeing (77%)
- Supporting to help children get the most from their education (81%)
- General information, advice and guidance (82%)
- Support and practical advice on keeping children safe (80%)
- Support in developing social networks through peer support and groups (81%)
- Support with meeting children and families emotional needs (79%)

Access to support regarding home and money including impartial debt advice was seen as the least important but was still highlighted by 46% of respondents to the

question.

The additional comments highlighted that existing services should not be diluted in order to offer services to the older age group and asked that these changes ensure that the importance of early years is still recognised as part of this wider work.

#### *Other services*

Respondents were asked to outline whether there were other services that should be offered. The comments included community café, dad's groups, playground for families, twin group, activities for children with disabilities, advice on applying for school or nursery places, after school or school holiday activities, exercise classes, coffee mornings, family cooking classes, first aid, groups targeted at teenagers, health visitor clinics, mental health support, homework clubs, and an advice line.

### **3.3 Summary**

The main themes that emerged from the consultation were around :

- Child development
- Health and wellbeing
- Networking, social family time, groups in particular twins groups, dads groups, SEND groups
- Information, advice, and guidance locally available using different channels
- Adult support for training, entry to employment
- Extended opening hours

The overall conclusion from the consultation can be summarised as follows:

That:

- There was support for the proposal that Family Centre areas provide a range of early help services for families with children pre-birth to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has SEND).
- Services should include support with physical and emotional health and wellbeing practical advice on keeping children safe, developing social networks through groups, support with education and learning, parenting, positive family routines, home and money, advice and support with training and entry into employment.
- The Family Centre main address should be based in the most vulnerable areas of the City
- Services should be delivered in localities utilising community venues for outreach delivery allowing families to access services where it meets their

needs.

- Parents and carers reiterated they want high quality flexible services in the right place at a variety of days and times.

The recommendations that we are putting forward reflect the concerns that were raised during consultation e.g. all previous centres that are not a main address are now a linked centre.

#### **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

The proposal, if approved by Cabinet, will provide families with accessible locally based services offering information, advice and guidance, with a focus on early help identifying need when it first appears offering a holistic support service. This would mean that whatever the point of access for parents they would be able to find a service or range of services to meet their needs and those of their children.

The proposal will ensure that the Council continues to meet its statutory duty as set out in the Childcare Act 2006 and fulfils its duty to improve outcomes for all children whilst reducing inequalities between them.

It builds on the importance of identifying children and families who would benefit from early help as set out in Working Together to Safeguard Children (March 2016).

The Joint Needs Assessment (2013) for the City recognised the necessity to 'find new ways of responding to need which places a premium on prevention and early intervention, integrated working and care in the community'.

The proposals build upon the current partnership working between the Council health, education, social care and employment services and offers opportunities for further co-location and joint delivery of integrated services for the 'whole family'.

There is a potential risk of claw back of funding from Government, if any Sure Start buildings no longer provide services for families with children under 5 years old. There is no risk of claw back within this proposal as services for families of children under 5 years will continue to be delivered in those buildings.

##### **4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications**

4.1.1 Decisions need to take into account the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This is the duty to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected

characteristic and persons who do not share it

- To help evidence meeting the requirements of the duty, we have carried out a full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) and which is attached as Appendix 3.

The Equality Act 2010 identifies the following groups as a protected characteristic:

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion or belief
- sex
- sexual orientation

An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and highlights that the new Family Centres will have a positive impact on tackling poverty; improved health outcomes; a wider age range (young people 0-19 or 0-25 where a young person is disabled); disability; pregnancy and maternity; different racial groups; both gender's though it is recognised that the majority of staff and service users are female; the Voluntary, Community and Faith sector and partner organisations will have a key role.

## 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 The proposals reconfigure the way the existing services are organised but core services will continue to be delivered in various sites across the city but no additional costs will be incurred.

Any changes in the use of individual buildings (i) will be agreed with each hosting organisation and will be subject to a further Cabinet report if required (ii) will ensure that there continues to be early years delivery to avoid any potential risk of claw back of Surestart Capital grant.

## 4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 Duties to arrange services / provide Children's Centres:

Section 3(2) of the Childcare Act 2006 ("the Act") places a duty on the Local Authority to make arrangements to secure that early childhood services in their area are provided in an integrated manner which is calculated to a) facilitate access to those services; and b) to maximise the benefit of those services to parents, prospective parents and young children.

In deciding what arrangements to make under this section, a Local Authority must have regard to a) the quantity and quality of early childhood services that are



provided, or that the authority expects to be provided, in its area and b) where in that area those services are provided or are expected to be provided.

In discharging duties under this section a Local Authority must also have regard to any guidance given from time to time by the Secretary of State. Consideration has been given to the Sure Start Children's Centre Statutory Guidance 2013 in forming the proposals contained within this report.

Section 5A of the Act places a specific duty on the Local Authority to make arrangements, so far as is reasonably practicable, for sufficient provision of Children's Centres to meet local need.

The Act does not prohibit the use of Children's Centres for other purposes, and any integration of services for 5 – 19 year olds (25 year olds where the young person has SEND) can be implemented under the Council's general power of competence as set out in section 1 of the Localism Act 2011.

Public Sector Equality duty:

The public sector equality duty described at 4.1.1 above has been taken into account in drawing up the proposal recommended in this report, and in carrying out consultation. Regard has been had to the responses to the consultation in finalising the proposal.

#### 4.4 Other implications

##### 4.4.1 Property:

This paper seeks approval to develop a new delivery model based on 7 geographical areas that cover the entire city with delivery of services from a main Family Centre site and link centres and outreach services being delivered across the locality from community venues or in the home.

The proposals do not seek to close any of the 16 Children's Centre sites, but recommends that 7 of those sites remain the designated address i.e. the proposed Family Centre sites. The remaining 9 sites are proposed as link sites within the new delivery model and will continue to provide community outreach services. All sites and services delivered pre-birth to 5 years in the 7 localities will be subject to Ofsted inspection.

## 5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

The alternative approach would be for the council to continue to deliver Children's Centre Services from 16 children's centre areas, this approach does not align to the principles set out in the early help model, the Best Start 'A Great Start in Life' strategy, the SEND reform and Working Together to Safeguard Children which are underpinned by delivery of services based in localities where services work together to achieve improved outcomes for families as close to their homes and communities as possible.

Fundamental to the proposal is a whole household approach, by not extending the age range of services and developing Family Centres with link and outreach sites, the alternative would be to continue to deliver services to families pre-birth to five years old. This would not support the provision of integrated early help for families, would not align to the early help services for families aged five to eleven years or to the targeted youth support service leading to more negative outcomes for both children and families.

## **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the 19th October 2016 a report was approved at Cabinet to allow statutory consultation to take place on a proposal to re-model the Children's Centres in Sheffield. The proposal supports the development of a more integrated approach with a greater focus on early help and with partnership working between the Council health, Police, schools and voluntary sector to deliver a broader range of services provided across a network. This allows professionals to respond to a breadth of family needs such as health and wellbeing, housing, education, and employment. It is underpinned by information sharing protocols and builds on the premise that the safeguarding of children and young people and outcomes for families will be improved. The key elements of the proposal are as follows:

### *Development of Family Centres*

- The redesign of Children's Centres, developing a new delivery model based on family centres. These centres would be available for families of children pre-birth up to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has SEND).

The creation of a Family Centre delivery model builds on the principle of early help and focuses on making interventions at an early stage once problems have begun but before they escalate. It provides an opportunity to build on the existing locality models that were piloted with many schools across the city and evaluated very positively. This model is now being developed further to include a broader range of partners including police, health, SEND teams and housing staff.

- *7 locality areas*
- Children's Centres would be re-organised into an integrated locality model. It moves away from a single centre delivery model to a networked locality model based on the achievement of common outcomes.

The city would be divided into 7 geographical areas and the existing centres areas will be altered to create seven locality areas. In each area there will be a lead centre which will remain a designated Children's Centre address and will be inspected under the current Children's Centre Ofsted Inspection framework in relation to services for children and families pre- birth to five years old. This inspection will cover all centres and services delivered in the whole geographical area.

- *Locations*

The main site for the Family Centres, the linked sites and outreach services will be located in the 20% most deprived areas of the city. It will act as a base for a full range of integrated services, to enable a clear focus for services on local need and priorities, and to provide support to those who are most vulnerable. Additional services also be available across Sheffield from link and outreach sites including schools, GP surgeries local community venues such as church halls and youth centres and in the home. These sites will offer clinics, groups and drop in services on a timetabled basis. Families will be able to access support outside these times through the venues or through one to one support in the home.

The proposal is intended to build on existing strengths, expertise and current infrastructure in Children's Centres and will join together and coordinate services around children and families. It recognises the critical role that Children's Centres have played in prevention and early intervention and will support further development, allowing us to join together and coordinate services offering the community universal, targeted and specialist services.

In summary the model will:

- Provide a range of early help services for families with children pre-birth to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has SEND) either in the lead centre, link site or outreach venue using different channels to include face to face in the home, centre, drop ins, group work, internet access, online advice guides, email, text, telephone and social media.
- Provide services to include support with physical and emotional health, practical advice on keeping children safe, support with education and learning, support with parenting, home, money, work, training and volunteering.
- Have a main address located in 20% areas of highest need based on the IDACI index of deprivation, with outreach services for all families delivered jointly with universal services.
- Be developed with families, partners and stakeholders within communities building on the current Children's Centre governance model in relation to community partnerships and stakeholder forums.
- Align to the seven localities with families being able to access services where it meets their needs.
- Have services delivered at venues in a mix of times and days through regular, ad hoc, drop in basis, and one to one with opportunity to extend and develop this.

The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient children's centres in its area to meet local need. The proposal will require a reduction in the number of buildings designated as a main Children's Centre address from the current 16 to 7 main family centre areas but with the addition of link sites in the most disadvantaged

areas of the city which should allow for greater access to services. More services would be delivered at outreach and community sites reaching those most in need in their own community.

**Key research, evidence base:**

The Munro review of child protection calls for local authorities to take a greater focus on preventative services, providing Early Help to children and families and summarises three key messages:

- Preventative services will do more to reduce abuse and neglect than reactive services
- Coordination of services is important to maximise efficiency and with preventative services
- There needs to be good mechanisms for helping people identify those children and young people who are suffering or likely to suffer harm from abuse or neglect and who need a referral to children's social care

Munro, (2011), The Munro Review of Child Protection: final report, DFE

The All party Parliamentary Group on Sure Start Children's Centres 2015 pre-election report states that 'One of the greatest strengths of Children's Centres has always been their capacity to join up a wide range of services around a child to provide a true "holistic" model of support'.

The report continues to state that 'the ultimate aim should be to position Children's Centres at the heart of service provision in their communities , to enable them to provide the sort of holistic offer we know to be valued and effective'.

The Centre for Social Justice argued that 'Children's Centres should become "Family Hubs" which enable parents to access all family related support including universal support and specialist help to meet their most pressing needs'.

The key findings from the Evaluation of Children's Centres in England (ECCE) , a six year study producing a detailed picture of the first 2 phases of Children's Centres in England , these which were aimed at the 30% most disadvantaged areas found that :

- There was a clear move away from standalone centres to those featuring clustering
- Higher Leadership and management scores were found in centres reporting better multi agency working
- There was a high level of shared vision , however there were tensions in terms of communication and data sharing and misunderstanding over professional roles
- Staff felt ill prepared over the policy shift to more targeted interventions.
- Centres shifted towards a more focused targeted range of services for parents and outreach to family homes.

- The number of services remained constant, the nature of the services changed, the frequency was often thinning and 'open access services' were being reduced while targeted services increased.
- Well evidenced programmes e.g. FNP were widely used by centres but were less common than other named programmes

## **Recommendations**

It is essential that the new model of early help for families builds on the current arrangements of integrated services with health, education, social care, police, DWP, community youth team, voluntary and private sector. There are opportunities presented by the proposal for further co location and joint delivery of services across the age range in order to provide a whole family approach.

This will build on the premise that safeguarding of children and young people and outcomes for families will be improved when services work together.

We would ask cabinet to agree the following recommendations:

- a new service delivery model based on dividing the city into 7 geographical locality areas, each area will include a main centre and linked centres or other community outreach sites for service delivery across the locality;
- an extension of the age range from pre-birth to 5 to pre-birth to 19 year olds (25 year olds if the young person has special educational needs or disabilities); and
- that the 7 Family Centre main sites named in the report to be the designated Children's Centres addresses in order to meet a statutory duty to ensure provision of sufficient Children's Centres in the Local Authority's area, whilst noting that such designation will result in all services pre-birth - 5 in the whole Family Centre locality being regulated and inspected by Ofsted under the current inspection framework for Children's Centres.
- that services will be delivered in main and linked centres and outreach venues across the locality. They will run at various times and days and with core and extra services provided by a range of agencies at a variety of venues. Those services could include clinics, groups, drop-in and timetabled sessions.
- to continue the current governance model of multi-agency partnership boards in each area which will support the assessment of need across the locality to ensure services meet the needs of families when and where they are required.

Appendix 1 - Map

Appendix 2 – Summary of consultation

Appendix 3 – Equalities Impact Assessment





**Author/Lead Officer of Report:**  
Kerry Bollington,  
Head of Commercial Business Development

**Tel:** 0114 273 5872

**Report of:** *Eugene Walker*  
**Report to:** *Cabinet*  
**Date of Decision:** *19<sup>th</sup> April 2017*  
**Subject:** *Capital Approvals for Month 12 2016/17*

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? <b><i>Finance and Resources</i></b>		
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? <b><i>Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee</i></b>		
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? <i>(Insert reference number)</i>		
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-		
<i>"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."</i>		

<p><b>Purpose of Report:</b></p> <p><i>This report provides details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 12 2016/17</i></p>
---

**Background Papers:**  
**Appendix 1 -**

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: <i>Dave Phillips</i>
		Legal: <i>Sarah Bennett</i>
		Equalities: No
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b>	<i>Eugene Walker</i>
3	<b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b>	<i>Councillor Ben Curran Cabinet member for Finance and Resources</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> <i>Kerry Bollington</i>	<b>Job Title:</b> <i>Head of Commercial Business Development</i>
	<b>Date:</b> 24 <sup>th</sup> April 2017	

## 1. PROPOSAL

### Summary:

- 1.1 A number of schemes have been submitted for approval in line with the Council's capital approval process. In the absence of a revenue and capital monitoring report in the current month, to avoid unnecessary delay to the progress of these projects a stand-alone request for approval is presented.
- 1.2 Below is a summary of the number and total value of schemes in each approval category for Month 12:
  - 2 additions of specific projects to the capital programme with a value of £3,839k (Schools Capital Maintenance and Howard Street Rill Renewal);
  - 1 variation to the capital programme creating a net increase of £87k and
  - 1 requests for slippage amounting to -£281k.
- 1.3 Further details of the schemes listed above can be found in



## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

The proposed changes to the Capital programme will improve the recreational leisure facilities, schools, roads and homes used by the people of Sheffield, and improve the infrastructure of the city council to deliver those services.

This report is part of the monthly reporting procedure to Members on proposed changes to the Council's capital programme.

By delivering these schemes the Council seeks to improve the quality of life for the people of Sheffield.

## **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

3.1 *No*

## **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

### 4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications

4.1.1 *No*

### 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

4.2.1 *Yes. Cleared by Kerry Bollington*

### 4.3 Legal Implications

4.3.1 *No*

### 4.4 Other Implications

4.4.1 *No*

## **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

5.1 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.

## **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 To record formally changes to 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.

## **7 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 Approve the proposed variations, slippage and additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1, including the procurement strategies, and delegate authority to the Director of Commercial Services to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group.

Scheme Description	Approval Type	Value £000	Procurement Route
<b>THRIVING NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES</b>			
<b>Highways</b>			
<p><b>Blackburn Valley Cycle Route</b>                      The Blackburn Valley cycle route is a part completed key strategic route that runs through and adjacent to significant employment and development site areas, linking into large residential areas that flank the M1 Corridor between Meadowhall and Junction 35a Business Park. The scheme will connect the two existing sections of cycle route (Phase One – Loicher lane to Smithywood and Phase Two – Chapeltown to Thorncliffe) and complement other works in the area, creating a continuous route of 9km from Meadowhall to Chapeltown, and connect onto routes in the Lower Don Valley allowing access to Rotherham and Sheffield Centres.</p> <p>Since the last business case was approved some additional costs have come to light, and it has become apparent that an earlier business case didn't include all the costs for Phase 1.</p> <p>As a result a detailed paper of the costs involved and how it happened was approved by Transport Sub Board 3rd April 2017</p> <p>The resulting variation is to add £87,986 to the project budget. £950K STEP funding is allocated to the project for all phases so any increase in costs for Phase 1 reduces funds available for Phase 2. There is also LTP funding of £12,153 available.</p> <p>Spend in 16/17 has only amounted to £41,421 therefore slippage is now included along with the variation:</p>	Slippage/ Variation	Slippage: 281 Variation: 88	Amey Non Core Works

<p><b>Slippage Identified</b>                  16/17 Budget £322,091                  16/17 Actuals £41,421                  16/17 remaining Budget to slip £280,670</p> <p>17/18 Budget therefore £280,670 + £87,986 = £368,656</p> <p>Total Phase 1 expected cost:: £82,295 15/16 + £41,421 16/17 + £368,656 17/18 = £492,372</p> <p><b>Funded by: Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) &amp; Local Transport Plan (LTP)</b></p>			
<b>SUCCESSFUL CHILDREN &amp; YOUNG PEOPLE :-</b>			
<p><b>CYPF Capital Maintenance Programme 2017-18</b>                  The following projects all form part of the planned CYPF capital maintenance works for the coming year. They are covered by common Procurement Strategies and hence are grouped together here as one programme for the purpose of requesting approval to spend in each area.</p> <p>Over recent years, a consistent annual programme of addressing priority maintenance issues has enabled Sheffield to reverse the decline of its school buildings. However, this followed years of significant under-investment and the need for investment still outstrips the resources available, particularly in the primary sector. This programme is to continue to identify priorities by carrying out condition surveys then addressing backlog maintenance across key headings to maintain business as usual and prevent closure of school buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergencies – Mechanical or otherwise</li> <li>• Adaptations – as recommended by Occupational Therapists</li> </ul>	Addition	3,802	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Emergency, Radon &amp; Adaptations: existing framework contractors</li> <li>•Planned Mechanical /FRA Work: existing Measured Term Contracts</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanical – Mossbrook, Halfway N/I, Brunswick, plus other vulnerable sites</li> <li>• Fire Risk Assessment – as per programme managed by CDS</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual project allocations for 2017-18:</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Primary Maintenance Emergency Works</td> <td>£120.0k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fire Risk Assessment Works</td> <td>£1,000.0k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Maintenance: Radon Extraction</td> <td>£7.5k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mechanical Replacement Mossbrook</td> <td>£945.5k*</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mechanical Replacement Halfway NI</td> <td>£375.8k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mechanical Replacement Brunswick</td> <td>£905.2k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mechanical Reactive Adaptations</td> <td>£348.0k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>£100.0k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td></td> <td><b>£3,802.0k</b></td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Funded by:</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>2017-18 Capital Maintenance Block Allocation</td> <td>£3,313.0k</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SF Devolved Formula Capital</td> <td>£489.0k*</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td></td> <td><b>£3,802.0k</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>*(existing approved DFC diverted to the priority maintenance programmes for primary schools; applied to Mossbrook).</p>	Primary Maintenance Emergency Works	£120.0k		Fire Risk Assessment Works	£1,000.0k		Capital Maintenance: Radon Extraction	£7.5k		Mechanical Replacement Mossbrook	£945.5k*		Mechanical Replacement Halfway NI	£375.8k		Mechanical Replacement Brunswick	£905.2k		Mechanical Reactive Adaptations	£348.0k			£100.0k		<b>Total</b>		<b>£3,802.0k</b>	2017-18 Capital Maintenance Block Allocation	£3,313.0k		SF Devolved Formula Capital	£489.0k*		<b>Total</b>		<b>£3,802.0k</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reactive Mechanical Work: in-house Corporate Repairs Service</li> </ul>
Primary Maintenance Emergency Works	£120.0k																																						
Fire Risk Assessment Works	£1,000.0k																																						
Capital Maintenance: Radon Extraction	£7.5k																																						
Mechanical Replacement Mossbrook	£945.5k*																																						
Mechanical Replacement Halfway NI	£375.8k																																						
Mechanical Replacement Brunswick	£905.2k																																						
Mechanical Reactive Adaptations	£348.0k																																						
	£100.0k																																						
<b>Total</b>		<b>£3,802.0k</b>																																					
2017-18 Capital Maintenance Block Allocation	£3,313.0k																																						
SF Devolved Formula Capital	£489.0k*																																						
<b>Total</b>		<b>£3,802.0k</b>																																					
<b>STRONG ECONOMY :-</b>																																							
<p><b><u>Refurbishment of Howard Street Rill</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Howard Street Rill is a water feature at the main entrance to Sheffield Hallam University The rill is in a poor state of repair which is detracting from the quality of the Gold Route.</li> <li>• The project to refurbish the rill will address the failure of the adhesive/grout used to stick the mosaic tiles, the poor functioning of the fibre optic lighting and the problem of water loss from the channel which led to the water being turned off in 2015. The rill has been in a poor state of repair for two years. In that time, officers have obtained expert</li> </ul>	Addition	37	Waiver of Standing Orders to enable original artist to maintain their installation.																																				

<p>advice and costs for the work and the funding to carry out the repairs has now been secured.</p> <p><u>Funding</u> The project is funded through S106 Public Art agreements, Sheffield Hallam University have contributed £5,000 to this project in recognition of the importance of the rill to their entrance. The maintenance costs are covered by revenue budget BU 21310 held by City Centre Management Team.</p> <p>The ongoing annual costs of maintenance are £5,822. These cover daily running costs, water quality and equipment checks and annual servicing, in addition to that over 25 years it is estimated that £23,375 of works would be required to replace items such as pumps, mosaics, lights etc. over the 25 year lifetime of the installation.</p> <p>e of the project</p> <p><u>Project Cost</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Create and installing new mosaic in rill</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lighting installation</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£3,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SCC Internal fees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£1,850</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Removal of old mosaic</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£1,580</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Make good rill and stonework</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£3,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Specialist Sealant Mosaic-Rill</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£640</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contingency</td> <td style="text-align: right;">£1,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Costs</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>£36,670</b></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Procurement</u> The artist's unique skills and the fact that the work is the copyright of the artist are considered appropriate grounds on which to seek a Waiver of Standing Orders to allow Emma Biggs the original artist to be directly appointed.</p>	Create and installing new mosaic in rill	£25,000	Lighting installation	£3,100	SCC Internal fees	£1,850	Removal of old mosaic	£1,580	Make good rill and stonework	£3,000	Specialist Sealant Mosaic-Rill	£640	Contingency	£1,500	<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>£36,670</b>			
Create and installing new mosaic in rill	£25,000																		
Lighting installation	£3,100																		
SCC Internal fees	£1,850																		
Removal of old mosaic	£1,580																		
Make good rill and stonework	£3,000																		
Specialist Sealant Mosaic-Rill	£640																		
Contingency	£1,500																		
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>£36,670</b>																		

<b>PROCUREMENT STRATEGY</b>			
<b>92913 Little Don Link Cycle Route</b> Budget approved at March17 CPG/April17 Cabinet. Procurement Strategy submitted to April17 CPG	PS		Competitive Tender via YORCivil

This page is intentionally left blank