

# Agenda Item 4

## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### Strategy and Resources Policy Committee

#### Meeting held 29 August 2024

**PRESENT:** Councillors Tom Hunt (Chair), Fran Belbin (Deputy Chair), Angela Argenzio, Kurtis Crossland, Dianne Hurst (Group Spokesperson), Douglas Johnson (Group Spokesperson), Abdul Khayum, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, David Barker (Substitute Member), Minesh Parekh (Substitute Member) and Andrew Sangar (Substitute Member)

.....

#### Welcome and Introductions

Statement from the Leader of the Council. Before we start today's meeting I would like to make a short statement. This is the first time that this committee has met since the violent disorder that we saw across the country and in South Yorkshire earlier this month.

What we saw in that week was not protest, but far-right hate. I utterly condemn those who tried to divide us by targeting asylum seekers, Muslims and minority communities and I condemn everyone who engaged in criminal acts of violence and hate on our streets and online. What we saw was racist and Islamophobic. It was an attack on what we stand for as a city. Like everyone here, I am proud that Sheffield is a welcoming city for people seeking asylum and proud that we are a City of Sanctuary. Our diversity is our greatest strength.

I am proud of the citywide response to the violence and would like to take this opportunity to say thank you. To the people of Sheffield who came together to reject racism and hate and show that it has no place in our city. To Sheffield City Council staff for their hard work to support communities, particularly the Local Area Committee staff who coordinated the response in our communities.

To our partners in the voluntary, community, social enterprise and faith sector for their commitment and dedication to protect and reassure communities, to calm tensions and ensure that people did not come to harm. To South Yorkshire Police for their critical role to protect and support local communities. I know we all send our best wishes to all officers who were injured in the line of duty. And to the criminal justice system for their ongoing work to take swift action against those who broke the law and who will now feel the full force of the law.

While we can be proud of our response, we cannot be complacent. People are still fearful and there is much to do to work with our partners to strengthen and develop community cohesion in our city. We will continue to celebrate our diversity and to stand firm against all forms of racism and Islamophobia, discrimination, and violence. We must work in partnership with the voluntary, community and faith sector, the Police, health organisations and with Government to engage with communities, promote unity, bring people together and ensure that Sheffield remains a welcoming city.

I know that there is cross party resolve to do that and so in that spirit I'd like to invite the other group leaders to give a short statement each.

Councillor Crossland gave a statement on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group. The country has rightly been appalled and outraged at the disrespectful and despicable actions by a tiny minority of people who rioted and carried out racist and Islamophobic attacks. They are facing the full force of the law and rightly so. We do also welcome the new measures announced by the government to clamp down on criminals attempting to terrorise our communities. Everyone has the right to feel safe in their homes, neighbourhoods and places of worship. Thugs, rioters and racism will never triumph in this country and it is however heartwarming to see so many people from all different backgrounds and cultures and all different walks of life coming together to bring their communities together in solidarity against racism and violence. We are indebted of course to our police officers who put themselves in harm's way to protect our communities and to protect our families and friends. People from all backgrounds and all walks of life have come together to condemn these riots and they're the ones who represent our country, they are the best of Britain and we need to say thank you to all of them.

Councillor Johnson Leader of the Green Party gave a statement. I agree with the statements made by others, it is important to condemn those who committed the violence. The behaviour that we saw was disrespectful, upsetting and a cause of fear and terror across our communities. Conversely, I want to thank all the people who stood up to the violence. This was a real test for people in Sheffield to stand up against those values of violence, intimidation and hurt that we saw. People did step up to that, people turned out to demonstrate against anticipated far right demonstrations in the counter demonstrations. They went there with some fear of what they were going to. A lot of us have a history of going to demonstrations but we don't normally go there thinking there's a possibility that things could turn violent, we are used to peaceful demonstrations in this city, and of course so it turned out to be. The so-called protests by the far right were a damp squib. The people of Sheffield prevailed, but it wasn't a pleasant experience. So, thanks to everyone involved, there are people in this room and also lots of people outside this room. I completely agree with the comments made so far and thanks to the Leader of the Council for saying those. We had the bizarre trigger for this event with a completely unrelated horrific set of murders in Southport that translated to this, somehow. There's no logical reason for that. This did not happen in a vacuum. Firstly, there's the policy of austerity which drives deprivation, which drives hatred which derives intent, neighbour upon neighbour. We have experienced many years of that on those big estates across South Yorkshire where people have been left behind or socially excluded. Secondly, the actions of some people in positions of power, responsibility and influence, mainstream politicians and mainstream media. We take it for granted that people can say overtly racist remarks to wide audiences, in the headlines of newspapers and utterances from the previous Prime Minister and I have to say it, politicians of the Labour Party to. These utterances single out communities who are particularly vulnerable and that is disgraceful. As a community, a society and at a national level in particular, we need to see a building of social cohesion. We need to ask the question why we have a system of segregation in this country, that treats asylum seekers unfairly and not in the same way as others when it comes to homelessness, access to work and to social care. This leads to an increase in segregation and avoids integration, which is not a good thing. This is a challenge for government at every level to address those.

Councillor Hurst gave a statement on behalf of the Sheffield Community Councillors' Group. Sheffields are rightly proud that we were the first city of asylum and we are proud of the work that we've done over the years to develop a genuinely multicultural society. However, the events of the past month lead us all to be aware that we can't stop in our efforts to build a genuine multicultural, supportive society, where everyone can thrive. I hope we direct our efforts to that going forwards.

## **29. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 29.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dawn Dale, Ben Miskell and Shaffaq Mohammed.

## **30. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

- 30.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

## **31. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 31.1 Councillor Douglas Johnson declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 9 on the agenda (Gleadless Valley Regeneration and Delivery Plan) on the grounds that he serves as the Chair of the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Members Board.

## **32. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 32.1 The minutes of the previous meetings held on 24 July 2024 were approved as a correct record.

## **33. PUBLIC PETITIONS, QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS**

- 33.1 Jane Edwards attended to present the following questions that she had submitted:

I'm surprised that a 'Whole Council' approach isn't common practice for major projects such as the Gleadless Valley Masterplan. In this paper, this is one of the recommendations, along with appointing a Head of Project Delivery and establishing a Board and a Delivery Group. Why wasn't this done before? An estimate of c. £662,000 of additional funding is also requested - how much of this is to buy in expertise? Has consideration been given to how the work of the Regeneration Team (annual cost of £740,000) will be assessed?

Answer: Thank you for your questions and for coming to the meeting today. The existing governance and delivery arrangements were appropriate for the existing Masterplan, given that the focus of the Masterplan was clearly on refurbishment, remodelling and replacement of council housing using Housing Revenue Account funding.

However, as set out in the report, construction cost inflation means that the current Masterplan proposals are not affordable within the Housing Revenue

Account. Other sources of funding will need to be found and that will involve working more intensively with other parts of the Council and with external partners such as housing associations. The recommended changes to governance and delivery arrangements (including the proposed Head of Project Delivery, Regeneration Board and Delivery Group) are designed to enable this new approach by bringing senior staff and members from across the council together with residents, partners and community organisations.

The additional funding is for revenue activity. Most of this activity involves paying for additional expertise - a mixture of council staff time and external support in the form of advice, data analysis, research, design, community engagement, etc.

The Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team will provide the main resource delivering the work of refreshing the Masterplan and developing a delivery plan and their progress in doing so will be closely monitored by the Gleadless Valley Delivery Group.

33.2 Maggie Young attended to present the following questions that she had submitted:

I welcome the acknowledgement that the existing plans have stalled and it's time for a new approach to the Gleadless Valley Masterplan. However, how will residents who were promised compensation in 2017, as their houses were due to be demolished or remodelled, be compensated?

What assurance can be given that residents who have waited for so long in unsatisfactory housing, will not still be waiting in the same position in another 10 years, given that the first new Housing Developments are not due to come to fruition until 2027?

Answer: Thank you for your questions. On behalf of the Council, I apologise for the delay and for the uncertainty that those residents whose homes were due to be demolished or remodelled have experienced.

The Council has established a Gleadless Valley Repairs Project Team which is initially targeting the backlog of repairs to those residents whose homes were due to be demolished or remodelled. This should address any immediate issues.

The purpose of the proposed new approach is to get new housing built as quickly as possible, but this will involve looking again at the plans so that we have something that is affordable and deliverable. If the refreshed proposals no longer involve demolition or remodelled of these homes, we fully intend that they will be included in the scope of refurbishment works instead.

Residents who are still required to move home will be provided with home loss compensation which is intended to cover the costs of moving home.

I am genuinely sorry for the delays that residents have experienced, and I don't

underestimate how difficult and frustrating this must be. The report that I hope the Committee will approve today is the first step in a new approach. I hope that this will give residents reassurance that this project will now move forward with a commitment that we will develop the refreshed masterplan in the next 12 months. I accept that we have a lot of work to do to build trust with the local community after the delays that they have experienced.

33.3 The following question, submitted by Sally Pedley, was read out:

1. What steps have been taken to seek compensation and recover the costs paid to Turner and Townsend cost consultants in underestimating the cost of the master plan by half? Regardless of the impact of Covid.
2. How was the proposed membership of the new GV Regeneration Board decided? Who decides the membership of the board?
3. Why are GV ward councillors not included on the board as they are local stakeholders, who represent Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents. Why are the chairs of Strategy and Resources and the South LAC, who have little to no connection to the area included?
4. How are you deciding who an "Independent Chair" is and why should the chair of the new GV Regeneration Board be independent and unconnected to the area?
5. Why after the years people have been waiting for this to start is it now being reset, with no clear communication to tenants living in properties that were told would be demolished.

Answer: The Turner and Townsend costs were accurate at the time, based on the information available to them. The increase in costs is due to construction cost inflation and the identification of additional costs (such as rehousing costs) that Turner and Townsend were not asked to estimate.

This report is asking this committee to agree the broad parameters of membership of the proposed new Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board. This is an important statement of the importance the Council is attaching to Gleadless Valley and our intention to work in genuine partnership with residents and local community organisations. In line with the boards for other regeneration projects in the city such as Castlegate and Attercliffe, we will ask interested residents and organisations to put themselves forward and the Board will have flexibility to determine its own membership and bring new members in as required.

I look forward to working with other members and officers to agree the details of the Council's representation on the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board. I recognise that local ward councillors are key stakeholders who have deep knowledge of Gleadless Valley and the local community. The report suggests that one ward councillor is represented on the Board but the Board will have flexibility to adjust the membership (for example to have more than one local councillor on the Board) if that is considered appropriate. Local ward councillors will also be involved directly in the workstreams and through regular briefings with council officers.

As the Chair of Strategy and Resources Committee I welcome the opportunity to

sit on the Board which I hope demonstrates my commitment to Gleadless Valley. As the report sets out, we need help from others if we are going to deliver a regeneration programme of this scale in the current financial climate. I will use the influence I have as Leader of the Council to secure senior level support from partners.

The Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board should be a forum to think big about the future of Gleadless Valley and get residents and partners behind an exciting vision for the area. The Chair of the Board will play an important role in leading this process and getting people working together.

The idea of an independent chair for the Board does not appear in the committee report but has been suggested by officers in other forums. The idea behind this is that it might be useful to have someone independent of the Council chairing the Board as a sign of the council's commitment to genuinely working in partnership with others. This would however be for the Board to decide and would be dependent on finding the right person. I believe we would want someone with a strong personal connection and commitment to Gleadless Valley, along with board level experience in business or public life.

Recommendation 6 of the report is that residents living in blocks that are identified in the existing masterplan for demolition or remodelling should be informed that the plans for their blocks are being reviewed and may change. We recognise that it has been very hard for these residents to plan for the future so it is important that we give them as much information as we can, and we will write to all of these residents shortly. However, it is also important that we don't make promises that we can't keep so I want us to be 100% sure that the revised plans are deliverable before we give residents new timescales for rehousing.

33.4 The following question, submitted by Iren Wadsworth, was read out:

Sheffield City Council's Plan includes making great, welcoming, clean, green and healthy neighbourhoods that people are happy to call home.

Many of us who live in Gleadless Valley are not happy to call our neighbourhood home or welcome people to it because of the Council's failure over a longstanding period to fulfill its statutory obligations. Documented failures regarding the repair and maintenance of housing aside, very little seems to be planned to tackle ongoing issues such as weed covered and unrepaired pathways, steps, communal entranceways and planted areas along with shoddy mowing, unending littering, fly-tipping and so on. A big positive difference to the majority of people who live in Gleadless Valley and to help attract businesses and investors to the area would be to properly solve these issues that make the estate look grotty, unwelcoming, uncared for and hazardous in places.

My question to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee is whether the possibility of Sheffield City Council finding funds to employ people 'on the ground' to tackle these issues is being or will be explored, especially as the preparation of the revised Gleadless Valley Masterplan proposals is being undertaken?

Answer: I fully recognise that management and maintenance of the public areas around the housing make a big difference to the overall impression of the area and the quality of life for residents.

We need to tackle this as part of the regeneration. The housing refurbishment proposals will look at communal entrances, paths and spaces around the housing. The Green and Blue spaces workstream will look at how these areas could provide better amenity for local residents, for example through planting and play areas, including by supporting resident-led projects.

But there is no point in investing in these areas if they are not going to be well maintained. So developing a management and maintenance strategy for the estate is a key piece of work we need to undertake alongside developing the revised proposals.

In the meantime, we will look for ways to make visible changes quickly, for example by targeting littering hotspots, working with the police to target fly tipping and reviewing existing mowing regimes.

33.5 The following question, submitted by Charlie Hill, was read out:

- What does mixed tenure mean? - private housing/renting? Will Landlords be local? Live in Gleadless Valley/Sheffield/South Yorkshire?
- What's the percentage of private/social housing?
- What does 'affordable' housing mean?
- How is the workstream for green and blue spaces going to engage with issues around motorbikes and pedestrians?
- Does it have plans to develop areas in the woods where each group can do their activity?
- What does natural surveillance mean?
- local people are asking for more family /primary age activities/after school care (early intervention in antisocial behaviour?).
- Are there plans for this? - playground in Gleadless, play areas in woods?
- How will the team ensure local people are employed for the construction work ? advertising work in Gleadless Valley?
- 'making the most of the Valley's proximity to the city centre, excellent bus links'
- major bus routes number 1& 11 are discontinued from September 1st - connecting Heeley green ,Newfield Green, Gaunt Road and Herdings - local residents are concerned about how they will move from one end of the valley to other- can the team consider how this will affect local peoples access services & amenities?
- What are the new ways the team will develop community engagement? (the community are 'Fatigued with engagement')

Answer: In terms of 'mixed tenure', we remain committed to an increase in affordable rent housing in Gleadless Valley so that local tenants can stay in the area and benefit from the regeneration. As well as new affordable rent housing, we believe there is an opportunity to provide other types of housing which will help to meet the wider housing needs of the city and help to support local shops

and services. This could include other types of affordable housing such as discounted rent or shared ownership, as well as homes for sale or rent at market prices. The exact mix will need to be determined as part of reviewing the development proposals. We don't know yet who any new landlords will be, but we would expect them to be institutional landlords such as housing associations rather than individuals.

I completely understand the issues you mention about anti-social behaviour. In relation to the issues you raise about the woods, we will work closely with residents and relevant stakeholders to develop proposals that address these issues and make the woods a safe and welcoming place for everyone, including children. We would welcome Heeley Development Trust's involvement in developing the plans. Plans are already being developed for new play facilities at Spotswood which we are aiming to complete by next summer.

In relation to employment and enterprise opportunities for local residents, we will ensure that construction contracts include apprenticeships and other training opportunities, and we will prioritise Gleadless Valley residents for these opportunities. The proposed employment and skills delivery plan will set out more details of how opportunities will be made available to Gleadless Valley residents.

We recognise and share your concerns about changes to bus services serving Gleadless Valley. We will work closely with the South Yorkshire Mayor to review and seek to improve public transport to benefit residents and support the regeneration of the area.

In terms of community engagement, we recognise that local community groups and voluntary organisations have strong roots within the local community, so the intention is to work closely in partnership with those groups to engage local residents in the regeneration. There will be a wide range of ways of getting involved, from responding to formal consultations, through attending events, to sitting on workstream working groups or the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board.

33.6 The following question, submitted by Jenny Fortune, was read out:

We are very pleased to see SCC' s intention to carry out this pilot on the Gleadless Valley estate. How will the team be established and who will it be immediately accountable to regarding:

- 1.Choice and range of typologies
- 2.Standards & monitoring applied to the retrofit pilot, for eg: will it be zero carbon?
- 3.Measurement of community engagement & skills development.

Answer: Thank you for your questions and for your interest in the proposal for a Deep Retrofit Pilot. We look forward to working with the Gleadless Valley Materials Bank alongside other partners on this element of the Refurbishment and Sustainability workstream.



Council officers envisage identifying and appointing a project manager to lead the project as soon as possible after the committee decision. The project manager will draw together a team of interested stakeholders to define the project further and will lead discussions with potential investors and energy companies to explore potential funding models and what each model might require in terms of typologies and standards. We know from other retrofit projects nationally that good community engagement will be vital to success, so this will form a key part of the project.

Day to day accountability for the project will be via the Workstream Lead - Dean Butterworth, Head of Housing Investment and Maintenance - who will report progress to the Gleadless Valley Delivery Group and the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board.

### **34. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

34.1 There were no Members' questions.

### **35. RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

35.1 The Director of Policy and Democratic Engagement submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

35.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
<b><u>City Futures</u></b>		
Andrew Godson	Senior Engineer	46
<b><u>Neighbourhood Services</u></b>		
Elaine Cresswell	Environmental Health Technician	23
Graham Lee	Community Technician - Higher Trades - Heating Engineer	22
Beverly Mullooly	Head of Neighbourhood Services	41
<b><u>Strategic Support Services</u></b>		
Julie Lamb	Health, Safety and Wellbeing Manager	40

Leigh Hall

Senior Lawyer

20

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

(c) directs that an appropriate extract of the resolution now made, under the Common Seal of the Council, be forwarded to those staff with over 20 years' service.

## **36. WORK PROGRAMME**

- 36.1 The Committee received a report containing the Committee's Work Programme for consideration and discussion. The aim of the Work Programme is to show all known, substantive agenda items for forthcoming meetings of the Committee, to enable this committee, other committees, officers, partners and the public to plan their work with and for the Committee. It was highlighted that this is a live document and Members input to it was invaluable.

It was noted that, subsequent to the publication of the agenda papers, it was now intended that the Sheffield Growth Plan item be submitted to the November meeting, rather than September. This was to allow for internal briefings in the following weeks and stakeholder engagement over September and October. Members highlighted the need to respond to the outstanding responses to Full Council motions and in particular to the item 'Reaffirming Sheffield as a City of Sanctuary'. Members discussed the appropriate place for consideration of issues that had an impact on the whole Council and it was stated that there was now an established principle that appropriate significant whole Council issues, for example the Housing Strategy, should come to Strategy and Resources Policy Committee for consideration.

- 8.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) agrees the Committee's work programme, as set out in Appendix 1, including the additions and amendments identified in Paragraph 4 of the report; and

(b) that the Sheffield Growth Plan item be moved to the list of items for the November meeting in the Work Programme, rather than the September meeting, as now reported.

## **37. GLEADLESS VALLEY REGENERATION AND DELIVERY PLAN**

- 9.1 The Executive Director City Futures submitted a report seeking approval for an improved approach to regeneration in Gleadless Valley that better works alongside the community, investors and partner organisations to see the ambitions in the Gleadless Valley Masterplan come to fruition. The proposal is to develop a One Council and partnership working approach to the delivery of

the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Programme in order to unlock and accelerate delivery of housing and green space improvements and deliver sustainable social and economic benefits to the local community. The proposals include an improved approach to regeneration, a new delivery structure to drive social and economic regeneration and new governance arrangements to facilitate partnership working.

9.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

- (a) notes that due to rapid build cost inflation, the existing Gleadless Valley Masterplan proposals previously approved in 2022 are no longer deliverable within the allocated Council budget and that delivery of the housing and green space improvements has stalled;
- (b) approves the development of an improved approach to regeneration in Gleadless Valley involving working across the council, with voluntary and community groups and with delivery and investment partners to bring additional expertise, capacity and funding into the programme;
- (c) agrees that the current approved Gleadless Valley Masterplan proposals should be reviewed and updated to reflect the new approach to regeneration. The review should also consider the potential for physical improvements to housing and open spaces to be complemented by social and economic interventions to address the high levels of deprivation in the area and build thriving communities. Once the review is complete the draft revised proposals to be brought back to the appropriate Council Policy Committee for consideration and approval;
- (d) agrees that a Delivery Plan for the updated Gleadless Valley regeneration proposals should be developed over the coming year in partnership with the local community and potential delivery partners and investors. The Delivery Plan, once drafted, to be brought to the appropriate Council Policy Committee for consideration and approval, at which point the full financial implications and risks will be considered;
- (e) agrees to the establishment of a new Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board, bringing together residents, local community organisations, delivery partners and Council representative with the purpose of advising on the overall strategy for Gleadless Valley and aligning stakeholders to deliver the vision;
- (f) agrees that residents living in blocks that are identified in the existing masterplan for demolition or remodelling should be informed that the plans for their blocks are being reviewed and may change; and
- (g) approves the transfer of £662,300 from the Gleadless Valley Housing Revenue Account Capital Allocation into a Gleadless Valley Housing Revenue Account revenue budget to cover additional expenditure in the current financial year to implement the new approach to regeneration and

develop the Delivery Plan.

### **9.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 The Council embarked on the masterplan work in 2017 and spent four years developing the masterplan proposals in partnership with the local community. Rising construction costs have made it unaffordable for all of the proposed works to be funded by the council's capital programme.
- 9.3.2 Scaling back the masterplan to meet the council's budget would fail to deliver meaningful change for Gleadless Valley residents. Instead, the proposed approach will explore opportunities to use council spending to seed fund and de-risk the Valley for external investment from the likes of: Housing Associations, Institutional investors, the Combined Authority, Homes England and third sector organisations.
- 9.3.3 This new approach would also allow Gleadless Valley to better contribute to the ambitions that the council and partners have for the future of Sheffield as set out in the City Goals and Council Plan, for example inclusive housing growth, net zero and great local centres and facilities.

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

- 9.4.1 Alternative Option 1: Allocating additional HRA capital funding to the project in order to deliver the masterplan proposals in full  
This option is rejected as unaffordable within the HRA business plan. Sticking precisely to the existing masterplan would also fail to deliver significantly against the council's net zero commitments, or housing growth targets (a net increase of only 115 homes based on current plans) and would not address resident priorities for improved shops and services.
- 9.4.2 Alternative Option 2: Allocating additional HRA capital funding to the project in order to deliver the refurbishment, remodelling and green space improvements while delivering the redevelopment aspects of the masterplan through disposals to housing associations  
This option would still require a very significant uplift in the capital allocation to the project (from £40m to c£100m excluding any works to the shopping centres) which is considered unaffordable within the HRA business plan.
- 9.4.3 Alternative Option 3: Reducing the scope of the proposed works to meet the available HRA capital budget.  
This would allow delivery of (for example) around half of the refurbishment proposals in the masterplan plus some public space improvements. It would be a fast and relatively low risk delivery option but would deliver very limited improvements, lead to significant reputational damage and fail to deliver meaningful change for Gleadless Valley residents.

## **38. BUDGET MONITORING, QUARTER 1 2024/25**

10.1 The Director of Finance & Commercial Services submitted a report bringing the Committee up to date with the Council's revenue outturn position for 2024/25.

10.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee notes the updated information on the 2024/25 Revenue Budget Outturn as described in this report including the detailed committee budget monitoring information and management actions provided.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 The Council is required to both set a balance budget and to ensure that in-year income and expenditure are balanced. No other alternatives were considered.

**39. A SMOKE FREE GENERATION**

11.1 The Strategic Director of Public Health and Integrated Commissioning presented a report seeking authorisation to spend the Local Stop Smoking Services and Tobacco Control Interventions Support Grant, which is being made available to the Council by the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) totalling £650,694 from April 2024 for the delivery of stop smoking services and tobacco control interventions in Sheffield and across South Yorkshire. An officer decision was taken on 25th March 2024 to permit the Council to become the accountable body for this grant.

This proposal will contribute to the achievement of the vision of the 2022-2027 Tobacco Control Strategy in Sheffield which aims for people to live longer and healthier lives, smokefree. The vision is also that Sheffield children grow up in a city where smoking is unusual; and that Sheffield is a smokefree city in which to live, work and play. Our ambition to make smoking obsolete by 2030 or to get to 5% prevalence in adults across all social groups. This strategy was signed off at Council Cabinet in April 2022.

11.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) approves the grant of £65,000 to Humber and North Yorkshire Integrated Care Board to contribute to the Yorkshire and Humber Smokefree campaign, as outlined in this report;

(b) notes the Council's intention in becoming a key partner and funder of the South Yorkshire Tobacco Control Alliance and entering into a partnership agreement. (This decision will be taken via an officer decision report); and

(c) notes the £127,694 being allocated to the incentive scheme in which the Council will commission goods and services, as outlined in this report. (This decision will be taken via an officer decision report).

### **11.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 By approving the grant of £65,000 to Humber and North Yorkshire Integrated Care Board to contribute to the Yorkshire and Humber Smokefree campaign on behalf of the South Yorkshire Tobacco Control Alliance will enable Sheffield to maximise the opportunity to support smokers further in increasing quit attempts and quit outcomes and ultimately reducing smoking prevalence and associated harm and health inequalities amongst our most vulnerable groups.
- 11.3.2 Furthermore, by the Committee noting the Council's intention in becoming a key partner and funder of the South Yorkshire Tobacco Control Alliance and entering into a partnership agreement, as well as noting the intention to deliver an incentive scheme ensures the committee have a full overview of the spend of the Local Stop Smoking Services and Tobacco Control Interventions Support Grant re: 2024/25 and future years. These plans will accelerate declines in smoking in Sheffield and South Yorkshire.
- 11.3.3 This proposal will contribute to the achievement of the vision of the 2022-2027 Tobacco Control Strategy where people to live longer and healthier lives, smokefree. Children will grow up in a city where smoking is unusual; and that Sheffield is a smokefree city in which to live, work and play. Our ambition to make smoking obsolete by 2030 or to get to 5% prevalence in adults across all social groups.

### **11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4.1 Alternative Option 1: All additional funding to be allocated to the community stop smoking service.  
This would lead to a contract larger in size than the demand we could hope to treat via services. Some money would be dormant in the contract and not used to best effect. Only 5% of the smoking population attend services – which is why large promotion and engagement is required. Population level interventions are necessary such as mass media campaigns to elicit behaviour change across the whole smoking population. By funding a range of interventions, we maximise the opportunity to meet the needs of a range of smokers, as people are motivated by different factors to quit.
- 11.4.2 Alternative Option 2: Smokefree App  
Whilst Smokefree App's have been proven to support smokers in achieving successful quit attempts at a population level with wide reach. Previous use of these in Sheffield has led to low uptake. Also, they do not support those who are digitally excluded and could in some cases such as, where English is not your first language provide further barriers to accessing support. This was not viewed as the best option to maximise quit attempts.

## **40. STREET TREE INQUIRY REPORT PROGRESS**

- 12.1 The Director of Policy and Democratic Engagement presented a report providing an update on progress towards the recommendations made by the

Lowcock report into the street trees dispute, and the additional commitments made in the Council's response.

The report sets out the good progress that has been made against the substantial majority of the recommendations that were due to be completed by this point. It also explains the reasons that a small number of recommendations have not been completed within the original timescales and describes how these are intended to be progressed and resolved.

Finally, it sets out progress against the wider and longer-term recommendations which are not yet due to complete and proposes that these be monitored via the relevant programmes of work that these relate to, including, particularly the Future Sheffield programme.

**12.2 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) notes the progress made since the last update to the committee in December 2023 towards the actions agreed in the June 2023 'Learning from the past and moving ahead: response to the Sheffield Street Tree Inquiry' report;

(b) notes the ongoing work to complete the remaining apologies to those who are owed them, and notes the renewed progress on the work to design and install a commemorative plaque in the Town Hall;

(c) notes the underpinning reports that sets out in more detail the key activity relating to governance, information management, organisational culture and transformation, and to agree that the remaining actions in these areas should be progressed through the relevant service areas and/or programmes as set out in section 4 of this report, with contingent decisions being made and monitored by the relevant committee; and

(d) agrees that whilst good progress has been made, the most critical lessons of the street tree dispute are the importance of listening to the people and communities of Sheffield, to hearing different points of view, to reflecting on mistakes and to being open to feedback at all times, and further agrees to commit to an ongoing dialogue with the people of Sheffield as the organisation continues to improve

**12.3 Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 There has been substantial progress towards the recommendations for Sheffield City Council as set out in the Lowcock and subsequently agreed by Strategy and Resources Committee in June 2023.

12.3.2 This progress includes taking forward actions across the themes of reconciliation, Streets Ahead, and the wider council, and means that the actions that were recommended to have been taken by this point are now substantially completed. As such, it is not proposed that a further report is

brought to the committee, but that the remaining actions are taken forward within other workstreams (including, particularly, the Future Sheffield programme which will drive the wider transformation of the organisation).

- 12.3.3 Although the immediate actions recommended by Sir Mark in his report have now been completed, it will take concerted ongoing effort to fully respond to the findings of the report and to reset the council's relationship with communities and to regain trust with those who were let down by the council's approach during the street trees dispute.

#### 12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 Alternative Option: Not to provide an update report

It would have been possible not to provide a further update report to Strategy and Resources Policy Committee on this matter. This was dismissed because of the direct request of the committee for a further report on progress at this point, and because of the degree of public interest in the street tree dispute and the Lowcock Inquiry, and the Council's ongoing commitment to learn lessons and take action in response to the recommendations.

### 41. **ENTERING INTO A FRIENDSHIP AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF NABLUS**

- 13.1 The Executive Director City Futures submitted a report stating that, in February 2024, Strategy & Resources Policy Committee considered an International Update Report covering the Council's known international relationships and making recommendations in respect of them. As part of this consideration, the Committee agreed that the City Council enter into a Friendship Agreement with the City of Nablus, situated on the West Bank in Palestine.

This report outlines subsequent steps taken to implement the decision and seeks approval of draft wording for the proposed Friendship Agreement between the two cities.

- 13.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) approves the draft wording for a Friendship Agreement with Nablus, attached to this report as an Appendix and agrees that a signing ceremony (either virtual or in-person) be arranged; and

(b) notes the further steps to develop the relationship between the cities of Sheffield and Nablus, as described in the report.

#### 13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 Alternative Option 1:  
Do not enter into a Friendship Agreement with Nablus

The alternative option would be not to proceed to enter into a Friendship



Agreement with Nablus. Given the existing links with Nablus established through Sheffield community groups and the frequent public representations encouraging the Council to proceed to link with Nablus, it is felt that this would not be desirable.

#### 13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 13.4.1 Entering into a Friendship Agreement with Nablus provides the mechanism to find out more about Nablus and to identify any synergies and potential areas of collaboration between our two cities.

Following an initial 12-month period, the Friendship Agreement would be subject to review. If either party felt that there was no merit in continuing the relationship, then there would be scope to step away.

Sheffield City Council is supportive of the community links that have been established between groups in Sheffield and Nablus. Agreeing to enter into a Friendship Agreement between the two cities, presents the opportunity to raise awareness of these activities within the public domain.

This page is intentionally left blank