

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 20 November 2019

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Jackie Drayton, Mazher Iqbal, Bob Johnson, Mark Jones, Mary Lea, George Lindars-Hammond and Abtisam Mohamed

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Terry Fox and Paul Wood.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 The Chair (Councillor Julie Dore) reported that appendices to the reports at agenda items 13 and 14 (See minutes 12 and 13 below) – ‘Disposal of Land at Smithfield and Cross Smithfield’ and ‘Disposal of Land at 210 Rockingham Street’ - were not available to the public and press because they contained exempt information described in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person. Accordingly, if the content of the appendices was to be discussed, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet, held on 9 October 2019, were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of Governance

5.1.1 Russell Johnson commented that, having recently spent time in Newcastle and Liverpool, comparable cities having suffered similar austerity to Sheffield, it seemed to him that they were much more successful in providing vibrant and attractive places for their citizens than Sheffield, with better public transport, care for historic buildings, better cultural offer and many other aspects.

5.1.2 Mr Johnson asked whether this was because of unimaginative, arrogant and insular governance which failed to listen to other parties and had a moribund

cadre of officers, in Mr Johnson's view almost certainly guilty of malfeasance associated with the Streets Ahead PFI? Mr Johnson therefore asked if the Leader believed it was time for her to review her position, or at least announce that she would not be standing as a candidate in next May's local election?

5.1.3 As a point of order, Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children and Families, asked whether Mr Johnson should be allowed to accuse officers of maladministration in a public meeting? Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Business and Investment, added that, for Mr Johnson to make comments such as this, he needed to present evidence to substantiate this claim.

5.1.4 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, responded that the electorate of Sheffield would decide the administration of its City and, ultimately, the Leader of the Council. Councillor Dore would not be taking any further questions from Mr Johnson at this time following his remarks about Council officers.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Student Accommodation

5.2.1 Nigel Slack referred to agenda item 14 on the agenda for today's meeting in respect of Disposal of Land at 210 Rockingham Street. He commented that, at the last meeting of Full Council, he had asked the Council whether we still needed another 2000+ beds in the City. The response from the Cabinet Member commented on this scheme following a well tried formula for mixed developments but did not address that question of demand. Mr Slack therefore asked what was the current student bed capacity in this type of accommodation in the City? How many students are currently attending the two Universities? Were the Council aware of reports that many of these student blocks were operating at less than maximum capacity? If this information was not known, how could people be confident in this proposed development?

5.2.2 Mr Slack further referred to the confidential appendix in the report and commented that he would challenge the idea that every word of the exempted material was commercially sensitive. The approach of wholesale exemption from the public, and presumably non-Cabinet Councillors, did not promote full transparency and was, therefore, bad for the perception of democracy in the decision making process. Will the Council review this practice of wholesale exemption?

5.2.3 Mr Slack further commented that a number of paragraphs in the report stated that this was a student housing development, contrary to the comments made by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development at the last Full Council meeting. Was this a student development or a mixed scheme?

5.2.4 Mr Slack then referred to paragraph 3.1.2 of the report which stated 'The development of new purpose built student accommodation can also have a longer term impact by releasing traditional housing stock situated outside of the city centre back into the private market.' Mr Slack asked was there any evidence for this statement in the Sheffield housing market or was it another anecdotal comment not supported by facts?

5.2.5 Mr Slack then referred to paragraph 4.1 of the report which stated 'There had

been no formal consultation'. Mr Slack commented that this implied that there had been some informal consultation. Was this the case?

- 5.2.6 Councillor Bob Johnson, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, responded that he had recently commissioned a Student Residential Strategy which would be submitted to Cabinet in due course which would provide the answers to Mr Slack's questions.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Mount Pleasant

- 5.3.1 Nigel Slack commented that he was still awaiting responses from his questions to the Scrutiny Committee meeting which had discussed the Mount Pleasant site in March 2018, this despite assurances from the previous Deputy Leader on 17 April and the current Leader on 17 July to chase the matter. Mr Slack attached the questions concerned, which were circulated to Cabinet and asked that the responses be expedited.

- 5.3.2 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, apologised to Mr Slack as she did not have the questions from the meeting but would provide a response in due course.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Cladding

- 5.4.1 Nigel Slack asked, with recent further serious issues over aluminium cladding, this time with a student block in Bolton, what response had the Council received to their enquiries about the safety of private residential blocks using aluminium cladding in Sheffield and when will the report on the Hanover cladding inquiry be published?

- 5.4.2 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, commented that, unfortunately, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety (Councillor Paul Wood) was not in attendance at the meeting to provide a detailed answer. She was aware that the publication of the report into the Hanover cladding was imminent. She would respond in writing if there was any further information available from Councillor Wood.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 It was noted that there had been no items called-in for Scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet, other than the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety taken on 14 October 2019 regarding the Council Housing Stock Increase Programme, the outcome of which was reported at section 6.2 below.

6.2 Call-In of the Decision in respect of the Council Housing Stock Increase Programme

- 6.2.1 It was reported that (a) a meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee had been held on Tuesday 19 November

2019 to consider a call-in of a decision made by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety taken on 14 October 2019 regarding the Council Housing Stock Increase Programme and (b) that the Committee had agreed that no action be taken in relation to the called-in decision, although the Committee had identified issues arising which would be fed back to the decision maker and/or added to the Committee's work programme.

6.2.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet notes the information reported.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

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

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Cabinet :-

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
<u>Place</u>		
Graham Carter	Electrician, Repairs and Maintenance Service	44
Mark Harris	Maintenance Supervisor, City Centre Management and Major Events	41
<u>People Services</u>		
Alison Anderson	Teacher, Norfolk Park School	33
Sandra Bishop-Wells	Residential Childcare Practitioner	29
Denise Lovell	Senior Teaching Assistant Level 3, Pipworth Community Primary School	34
Wendy Shepherd	Supervisory Assistant, Hucklow Primary School	22
David Stokes	Teacher, Ecclesall Primary School	40
John Webber	Teacher, Brightside Nursery Infant School	34

Jo Ullah

Provider Services Worker,
Future Options

34

(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. JOINT COMMISSIONING: THE SHEFFIELD RESPONSE TO THE NHS LONG TERM PLAN

8.1 The Director of Public Health submitted a report setting out Sheffield City Council's (SCC) support to the ongoing development of arrangements for implementing the priorities in the NHS Long Term Plan (LTP). It described several key principles that Cabinet were asked to endorse, then explained how, through the various joint arrangements already in place, Sheffield is responding to the challenges set out in that Plan. It identified a number of areas where the LTP's aspirations are considered to be too weak, set out the Council's response to those areas, and described SCC's aspirations for how the health and care system should work at neighbourhood, city and 'Integrated Care System' (ICS) geographies.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes and endorses the Council's response to the NHS Long Term Plan, as set out in the report;
- (b) endorses the direction of travel set out in the next steps section of the report;
and
- (c) requests that the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care engages in a dialogue with South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw (SY&B) ICS to ensure that the position set out in this report is given due consideration.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

Following consultation with the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Council, the report is the agreed way forward.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

To not accept the recommendations in the report.

9. TACKLING INEQUALITIES IN THE CITY THROUGH INVESTING IN GRANTS TO THE VOLUNTARY AND COMMUNITY SECTOR 2020-2021

9.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report seeking permission to

agree a grant aid budget, at a value of £1.437m, for a period of one financial year (2020-2021) for the purposes outlined in the report, and to extend the majority of existing grant aid funding arrangements for 12 months up to 31 March 2021, to allow for a full and thorough review of Voluntary Sector Grant Aid to be undertaken to (a) understand outcomes achieved from grant aid funding, (b) understand the impact on Council priorities of not funding the voluntary and community sector (VCS) and (c) gain an overview of total Council investment in the VCS.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet agrees an extension to the existing Grant Aid Strategy (2017-20) for 12 months from 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021, as outlined in the report, and in particular:-

- (i) approves the Grant Aid budget for the extension period of £1.437m for the financial year 2020-2021, as detailed within the report;
- (ii) approves the individual grant awards as detailed within the report and delegates authority for signing the necessary variations to the existing multi-year Grant Agreements to the Head of Communities where no such authority exists under the Leader's Scheme of Delegation;
- (iii) agrees that the Tackling Inequality Fund be re-launched for applications; and where no such authority exists under the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, delegates authority to the Head of Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, to award and manage such grant awards in line with the report;
- (iv) awards existing Lunch Clubs a 12 month extension for 2020/21, subject to a delegated approval of the Head of Communities in line with the report;
- (v) approves the extension of the Lunch Club Development Support for 12 months in line with the report, and where no such authority exists under the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, delegates authority to the Head of Communities to manage such Development Support in line with the report;
- (vi) where no existing authority exists under the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, delegates authority to the Head of Communities to:-
 - (A) agree the amounts, purposes and recipients of any individual grants awarded in-year from the Grant Funds including any additional sums received, returned or unpaid and to carry out such management and award and withdrawal of such funding as necessary and in line with the report;
 - (B) to allocate any other additional sums that may be received in-year from other parts of the Council or other partners as part of the Voluntary Sector Grant Aid process to fund local voluntary sector activity;
 - (C) to vire the budgets between the stated grant funds if an underspend is identified during the financial year; and
 - (D) to make changes to the 'outcomes and delivery' of grants for 2020/21 in line

with the objectives of the report.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 Extending existing arrangements for a year into 2020/21 allows us to continue to support the valuable work of the VCS, tackling inequalities in Sheffield in the most cost effective way, whilst we undertake a thorough review of the Council's investment in grant aid, how we can link to other funding streams and gain a greater understanding of the overall impact to its citizens.
- 9.3.2 The City Council wishes to continue to fund the voluntary sector through grant aid whilst understanding the financial constraints. We want to show the voluntary sector we value the excellent and wide ranging support they provide to a wide and diverse range of Sheffield residents.
- 9.3.3 Relaunching the Tackling Inequalities Fund, part of the overall Grant Aid monies, allows us to invite new organisations in the city to bid for funding to allow for innovative support to the City's diverse communities.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Make no reduction to the Grant Aid fund

A strong voluntary and community sector is the foundation for a thriving society, and is invaluable in supporting the Council's priority to reduce inequalities across the City of Sheffield, e.g. health, poverty.

9.4.2 Reduction applied to Citizens Advice Bureau grant only

Reducing the largest grant, the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) grant, means only one grant recipient receives a cut in 2020/21. CAB also receives funding from other services within the Council. However, this may lead to a reduced service to a particular community or loss of a post.

10. **MONTH 6 CAPITAL APPROVALS**

10.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme 2019/20, as brought forward in Month 6.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contract; and
- (b) approves the making of grants as identified in Appendix 2 of the report, and where the identity of any recipients is not known or to be confirmed,

delegated authority be given to the Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure to determine grant award in line with the objectives of the Clean Bus Technology Fund project, where no existing authority within the Leader's Scheme of Delegation exists.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.
- 10.3.2 To formally record 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.
- 10.3.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

11. **REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2019/20 - AS AT 30/09/2019**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing the outturn monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget 2019/20, as at the end of Month 6.
- 11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-
 - (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report and the attached appendices on the 2019/20 Revenue Budget Outturn;
 - (b) in relation to the Capital Programme, notes the forecast Outturn position described in Appendix 2 of the report;
 - (c) notes the review of the Treasury Management Strategy and prudential indicators in Appendix 4 of the report; and
 - (d) approves the requests in the Sheffield City Trust section of this report relating to operational subsidy funding and additional grant financing to support capital maintenance and approves the request for approval of funding for the Council's own additional costs for developing a long term leisure strategy.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

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

12. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT SMITHFIELD AND CROSS SMITHFIELD

12.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report seeking approval for Sheffield City Council to enter into an agreement for the disposal of freehold land at Smithfield and Cross Smithfield within the city centre.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposals set out within the report and the terms of the proposed agreement as explained in the appendix to the report, and declares the land identified surplus to the requirements of the Council;
- (b) delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer to agree the terms of the disposal and the terms of any other documentation required; and
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Chief Property Officer, to negotiate and complete such legal documentation as they consider necessary, on such terms as they may agree, to give effect to the proposals set out in the report.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 The intended outcome of the proposal is to deliver new private housing in a designated housing growth area and help assist with the continued regeneration of the St Vincent's Quarter. The development proposes to deliver a mix of housing tenures which are non-student and will include a significant number of affordable units.

12.3.2 The proposals will relocate existing businesses to other commercial sites within the city which are more sustainable and repurpose older commercial use buildings which are inefficient.

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 The Council could do nothing; this may result in the site remaining in its current use for several more years. As existing buildings deteriorate, levels of occupation

may fall and parts of the site may become derelict, as has been experienced with other sites within St Vincent's Quarter.

- 12.4.2 It is feasible that individual parts of the site may be brought forward for redevelopment in isolation; this could result in a compromised scheme or restrict the future redevelopment of other/adjacent sites.

13. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT 210 ROCKINGHAM STREET

- 13.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report seeking approval for Sheffield City Council to dispose of freehold land at 210 Rockingham Street to enable the assembly of a larger site to be redeveloped for student housing.

- 13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposals set out within the report and the terms of the proposed disposal as explained in the appendix to the report, and declares the land identified surplus to the requirements of the Council;
- (b) delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer to agree the terms of the disposal and the terms of any other documentation required; and
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Chief Property Officer, to negotiate and complete such legal documentation as they consider necessary, on such terms as they may agree, to give effect to the proposals set out in the report.

13.3 Reasons for Decision

- 13.3.1 The intended outcome of the proposal is to deliver new purpose built student accommodation within the city centre and repurpose existing commercial sites where older buildings are inefficient and would benefit from redevelopment.

- 13.3.2 The development proposals will help attract additional footfall in the retail core which will be of benefit to the city. The disposal will also deliver a significant capital receipt, New Homes Bonus and CIL contribution for the Council.

- 13.3.3 The proposals will deliver the economic and financial benefits as outlined within the report and its appendix.

13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The Council could do nothing. This may result in the site remaining in its current use for several more years. Other parts of the site may be brought forward in isolation which may result in a compromised scheme. This could also have a negative impact on the continued or future use of the Council owned land.