

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 16 April 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Leigh Bramall, Jackie Drayton, Ben Curran, Harry Harpham (Deputy Chair), Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Isobel Bowler.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 19 March 2014 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Petition in respect of Selective Licensing

Ahsan Ashraf submitted a petition, containing 30 signatures, opposing the Selective Licensing Scheme in the Page Hall area which was to come into force on 22 April. Mr Ashraf commented that, since the scheme had been agreed, house prices had collapsed and were now barely reaching £30k. 20 homes in the area were on Rightmove and were struggling to sell.

Four major banks had declared that they had stopped giving mortgages in the area as a result of the scheme. Landlords in the area were not happy and believed that they were being bullied into handing over money. Even though the scheme was due to go live on 22 April, landlords had still not yet seen any tenancy management standards which they would be expected to adhere to.

Landlords were further upset that the scheme did not allow them to pay in instalments. The rules on overcrowding would lead to a number of evictions and potentially leave children homeless. The scheme would directly impact on those least able to fight back. Mr Ashraf therefore asked the Council to reconsider its position in respect of Selective Licensing.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Selective Licensing

Mr Chisell asked why the Selective Licensing fee of £750 could not be paid in instalments when other things such as Council Tax and rent could be?

Councillor Harry Harpham, Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, responded that the proposals had been discussed with landlords for 3 months and there had been an opportunity for landlords to pay the fee in instalments during this period. He questioned landlords saying they were finding it difficult to find the money as they would have to find similar funds if something broke in one of their properties. As regards paying in instalments, legal advice had stated that the landlord could not have a legal license without paying the full fee.

In relation to the petition, Councillor Harpham stated that when consultation had taken place the overwhelming response was in favour with 60% of responses in support. The Council had listened to what landlords had said as the original proposal was for a selective licensing scheme across the whole area and this had now been modified to around 300 houses as a result of the consultation.

Councillor Harpham added that the scheme was not seen as a 'silver bullet' to solve all of the problems in the Page Hall area but it was a very important tool to help address some of the challenges such as overcrowding, the condition of the properties and anti-social behaviour. Landlords had a wider responsibility to the area not just collecting rent from their tenants.

Property prices had been falling consistently in Page Hall for a long time so Councillor Harpham did not accept the argument that they had fallen dramatically as a result of the Selective Licensing scheme. He believed that the scheme would actually help to drive up prices in the area.

Councillor Julie Dore, Leader of the Council, commented that she would check if 4 major banks had stopped giving mortgages in the area as she did not believe that to be the case. The scheme was not being introduced to punish landlords and was about improving conditions of houses and the wider community. Councillor Harpham added that negotiations were currently taking place with landlords in respect of the standards expected.

5.3 Public Question in respect of issues in the High Green area

Barry Bellamy referred to a number of questions he had asked at the North Local Area Partnership Cabinet in the Community meeting on 19 March 2014 in relation to the Streets Ahead project and sheltered housing. He commented that no responses had been received to these questions and therefore asked when he would receive a response.

Councillor Jack Scott reported that he understood a formal response to the issues raised had been sent to Mr Bellamy and he would investigate why this had not happened to this date. Councillor Julie Dore added that Councillors would be unable to do a walkabout in the High Green area, as promised, as they were currently under Pre Election Rules on Publicity (PERP) and this may be seen as trying to gain political advantage.

A promised meeting with Steve Robinson, Head of Highway Maintenance, had not yet been arranged as Mr Robinson had been on leave. He was now back in work and would arrange the meeting shortly. In respect of the rest of the issues written responses would be provided.

5.4 Public question in respect of City Stewardship Scheme

Robert Morris, UCAT Regional Secretary, asked, in light of the proposal to end the City Stewardship scheme, what were the plans for any future scheme and was it morally right to end a scheme which hundreds of young people had benefited from?

Councillor Harry Harpham responded that discussions had been held with local Trade Union representatives before the decision had been made and Councillor Tony Damms, Cabinet Adviser, and Janet Sharpe, Interim Director of Housing had met with young people involved in the scheme.

The scheme had been aimed at getting young people into future employment. However, the Council believed they could do better by looking at developing a better scheme. Many of the young people who had completed the scheme had been left with nothing afterwards. The gardening element of the scheme had been welcomed by tenants and Councillor Harpham was determined not to lose that part of it. Councillor Harpham believed a much better scheme could be developed through working with Cabinet colleagues and it was hoped that this could be introduced before the end of the year. UCAT were welcome to be involved in any discussions held on the development of the scheme.

Councillor Julie Dore added that it wouldn't be morally right to end the scheme without having anything to replace it but that wasn't the case in this instance.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Future Funding of the Voluntary Sector and the BME Network

Mubarak Hassan, Chair of the Sheffield Black Minority and Ethnic (BME) Network, commented that the Sheffield BME Network had been set up due to huge demand. It worked with the most deprived in the City and took a holistic approach. The Network recognised the financial constraints in which the Council had to operate but did not believe in the recent changes to the funding of the voluntary sector that a credible impact assessment had been undertaken in relation to the BME Network.

A credible impact assessment was needed to ensure the Council met the needs of the Race Equalities Act. The assessment felt to the Network like a desktop study rather than a real look at the impact of the changes on the grass roots. The Network would therefore like to call for a Stage 2 Impact Assessment to properly assess the impact of the changes. This needed to include up to date figures on health, employment and NEET's within BME communities.

In conclusion, Mr Hassan stated that the new formula for funding felt like a very

top down approach which had been rolled out without consultation. There needed to be an element of working in partnership and every organisation should be given the opportunity to apply for the funds.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Future Funding of the Voluntary Sector and the BME Network

Ronnie Lewin, Sheffield BME Network, commented that unemployment had risen to 55 % for BME young men. This did not enable those young men to take part in ordinary life activities or live in sustainable communities. Ethnic minorities made up 1/5 of the population of the City at the current time. Despite this the BME Network believed it still felt like a 'them and us' approach. The Council talked widely about inclusivity but it didn't feel that way to the Network at the present time.

The Network were in favour of the apprenticeship scheme but believed that inequalities were not just at the NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) level but across the board. The Network had developed an intervention policy in schools, particularly focused around exclusions with some success. The Network was therefore surprised that funding had been removed and this work had been ignored in the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA).

The Network believed that a piecemeal ad hoc approach had been taken to the new proposals. Mr Lewin also requested that a Stage 2 Impact Assessment be carried out and an investigation held into the whole process as he did not believe due process had been followed. The new Equalities Hubs did not replace the work of the BME Network and Mr Lewin believed this to be tokenistic and a 'tick box' gesture.

Mr Lewin concluded by asking with the changes to the funding will any new applicants be locked out from applying for the first 3 years?

In response to both questions from Mr Hassan and Mr Lewin, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, reported that, under the previous administration 3 voluntary groups had been funded by the Council, the BME Network, 50+ and Disability Sheffield. When Councillor Iqbal became Cabinet Member under the present administration he had met with other voluntary groups who believed that there was inequality across the City and a host of organisations who were not funded by the Council.

There was a need for a review of the funding arrangements in order to meet the requirements of the Equalities Act. When a meeting had been held with the BME Network in 2011 it was reported to them that the current arrangements could not continue as they were. In November 2013 it was confirmed that funding would cease but those protected groups could be involved in the exercise to establish the new funding formula.

Councillor Iqbal did not believe the new policy was a top down approach. The proposals had been changed as a result of the consultation. The EIA looked at what the impact of the proposals would be on various groups. It recognised the

impact but ensured the resources were there to support those groups impacted. Funding could not be guaranteed for 3 years as the Council's budget had been reduced by 50%.

Councillor Iqbal further commented that he valued the work done by the 3 groups mentioned within communities. The evaluation of the impact of the new proposals would be for the Network to do. The new model put forward ensured that the Council was being fair and equitable. He was happy to meet again with the BME Network but he could not give any assurances that funding would be available for 3 years.

Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, added that she had met with the BME Network on a couple of occasions. She had reviewed public health and resolved to take a different approach of a social model of delivery and to look at the root causes of health issues. She also wanted to look at a more social model of how the healthier communities programme was delivered.

A small resource had been allocated for the programme but this was only a start and there was a wish to put more resources towards housing and unemployment. Social capital had been looked at and the Council knew that this had been successful and wanted to make sure this happened in other areas of the City and officers were working on that at the present time. Councillor Lea believed that health inequalities were everybody's business. The Healthy Communities Programme was quite small but the Council would be doing its best within the deprived areas.

Councillor Julie Dore added that at the next meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board, made up of the Council, National Health Service and the Clinical Commissioning Group, the main agenda item would be health inequalities. The Board would look at what health inequalities were and what could be done to address them. She would ensure that statistics would be available at the meeting to aid the Board.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, thanked Mr Hassan and Mr Lewin and others who consistently reminded the Council about inequalities in the City. One of the biggest challenges for her was exclusions and not just those involving those from BME communities but also those receiving free school meals and those with special needs. She reassured them that Officers were working with schools through the City Wide Learning Body, to address these important issues and were continuing to work to resolve exclusions.

Councillor Drayton reminded them that she had met with the BME Network to discuss these issues. It was clear that the same issues remained and the Council needed to continue to work to resolve these. The Council had introduced such things as the apprenticeship programme, Made in Sheffield Curriculum and the 14-16 Programme in attempt to resolve the issues. The City-Wide Learning Body shared good practice. In respect of a reference made to Talent Watch, this was a Regional Programme rather than a Council one. She would go back and clarify

why the BME Network had not been involved with this.

5.7 Public Question in respect of Care Homes

Mr Nigel Slack commented that his Uncle was currently a resident in the Warren Park Care Home in Chapeltown. This facility and 21 others owned and operated by Mimosa Healthcare Holdings Ltd had recently been placed in receivership. Five of these were in the Sheffield City Region, with an estimated 300 plus residents at risk.

Mr Slack further referred to a recent report by Company Watch which stated that nearly 1 in 4 of UK Care Homes had a poor financial rating and if history was anything to go by 1 in 4 of those would fail. That meant 1,250 Care Homes at risk. Therefore, he asked with this in mind could the Council tell him when they knew that Mimosa Healthcare was going into liquidation? What financial health checks had been made on them recently? Will they now be checking the financial health of all Care Homes in the region? What contingency plans were in place if the homes could not be sold on as a going concern? And finally did the Council still consider the outsourcing of care services for vulnerable adults to be the right solution?

Councillor Mary Lea responded that she became aware of the situation with Mimosa on the 26th March. The Clinical Commissioning Group were the regulatory authority who were responsible for undertaking financial checks and they were in the process of undertaking checks nationally. Warren Park was the only Mimosa Care Home in the City and the situation was being monitored frequently. If it were to close she was confident that there was appropriate care available for those that needed it.

Roseberry Care Home was being managed whilst the Council established the current situation there. The Council managed the problems at Southern Croft very well and a number of care providers had come in to run the home.

The Council was also aware that many people wanted care and support in their own home and work was being undertaken to ensure that happened. It had been agreed as Council policy not to own any Care Homes. Most home care was provided by the independent sector and the Council had a robust set of monitoring policies and procedures. Free training was offered and the Council worked closely with providers when problems arose. The Council wanted to ensure that people stayed where they felt happiest.

5.8 Public Questions in respect of Scrutiny and Webcasting

Mr Nigel Slack referred to Item 13 on the agenda for the meeting, the Scrutiny Review. He commented that the report on this item was to be welcomed, as was the commitment to drafting new proposals within the next 9 months. He asked, with reference to paragraph 4.9 of the report, did this mean that the remit of the Scrutiny arrangements will be extended to including outsourcing companies? And will the increasing number of Supra-Council bodies, such as the Police and Crime Panel, the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (SCRLEP) and the

new Combined Authority be part of the Scrutiny Review?

Mr Slack's second question referenced paragraph 4.8 of the report which referred to engaging with the public. He asked would the Council be looking at the place of Webcasting in this process?

5.9 Public Question in respect of Scrutiny

Mr Alan Kewley, a Member of Sheffield for Democracy, referred to Item 13 on the agenda for the meeting, Scrutiny Review. He commented that he had taken part in the review in January 2014. However, he expressed concern over the lack of input of groups such as Sheffield for Democracy into the present process. Overall he welcomed the report and the recommendation for more input from local community groups. Mr Kewley asked how the Review would develop following approval of the report from Cabinet? He also asked how and when the public and local community groups would have the opportunity to become more involved?

5.10 Public Questions in respect of Scrutiny

Mr Michael Andrews asked two questions in relation to Scrutiny. Mr Andrews' first question asked why Scrutiny Committees were asked to help develop some policies but not others? For example, a Scrutiny Committee set up a Task and Finish Group to help develop the Housing Allocations Policy, whereas the Libraries Policy was developed by an Elected Members Task and Finish Group, set up outside the Scrutiny system. Why were these two policies developed differently? Mr Andrews also asked which Councillors were involved in the two Task and Finish Groups mentioned?

Mr Andrews second question referred to the Scrutiny Review report on the agenda and reference in the report to increased involvement of the Executive in planning the work of the Scrutiny Committee. Mr Andrews stated that he could see some advantages in this but asked whether there was a risk that the Executive could take control of Scrutiny? What safeguards would be put in place to ensure the independence of Scrutiny Committees?

In introducing the Scrutiny Review report, James Henderson, Director of Policy, Performance and Communications, stated that there was an intention to engage with community groups further through the process. Scrutiny already currently looked at partners, for example the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Committee had looked at the Streets Ahead project and spoken to representatives of AMEY. It didn't, however, look at scrutinising agencies such as the Combined Authority or the Police and Crime Panel, which was itself a Scrutiny body.

In relation to webcasting, this had been looked at in the past and proven to be expensive and technically difficult. It was, however, kept under review and had been discussed at a recent meeting of the Corporate Members' Group.

Councillor Julie Dore added that, in relation to Scrutiny's role in developing policy, there were different ways of developing policy. In relation to the Housing Allocations policy, the desire to improve this was cross-party and all had the same

desired outcomes. In relation to libraries, it was clear that there would not be cross-party agreement on the issue. That wasn't to say if there were political differences in the future that there wouldn't be a role for Scrutiny.

As well as formal Scrutiny, there were many informal ways of scrutinising something such as through the Local Area Partnerships. For example, the East Local Area Partnership had recently looked at the issue of youth unemployment.

It was important to ensure that the public were involved in designing and shaping policy and this could be done through the Equality Hubs, Local Area Partnerships and Cabinet in the Community. When developing policy a number of different consultation methods were used depending on the circumstances.

Scrutiny Committees would not be dominated by the Executive and it was about everyone coming together to realise the ambitions of the administration, the opposition groups and officers.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

6.1 There were no items called-in for Scrutiny.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

7.1 The Chief Executive 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>
<u>Children, Young People and Families</u>		
Lynn Barlow	Application Data Quality Officer	30
Marie Brown	Senior Supervisory Assistant and Pianist, Mosborough Primary School	27
Kirsty Crockford	Early Years Practitioner	22
Eileen Giles	Teacher, St Thomas of Canterbury School	28
Marina Glaves	Team Manager, Provider Services	38
Diane Green	Early Years Practitioner	30

Philipa Humberstone	Early Years Practitioner	36
Gillian McCormick	Early Years Practitioner	30
June Norris	Senior Teaching Assistant	24
Leslie Roberts	Buildings Supervisor, Hillsborough Primary School	28
Christine Schofield	Senior Teaching Assistant	31
Margaret Scott	Admin/Finance Manager, Abbey Lane Primary School	28

Communities

Robert Allison	Provider Services Worker	27
Susan Booker	Business Support Officer	31
Karen Brameld	Library and Information Assistant	39
Julie Clay	Personal Assistant, Peripatetic Team	30
Nick Hoult	Senior Development Officer	38
Keith McKinstrie	Service Manager	38
Richard Palmer	Head of Housing Commissioning	38
Carol Rickett	Financial Assessment and Advice Officer	26
Yvonne Wray	First Line Manager	36

Place

James Breakey	Practice Manager	29
Clive Chambers	Assistant Surveyor/Meter Reader	29
Deborah Davison	Senior Business Support Officer	21
Valerie De Haney	Technician, City Development	39

Lynn Fox	Senior Technician	27
John Gaunt	Planning Officer (Landscape)	39
Gary Gyton	Building Surveyor	31
Karen Hopkin	Administrative Assistant	23
Peter Latham	Principal Planning Officer	39
Janet Littlewood	Administration Officer	27
Lynn Mapley	Team Leader	34
Rebecca Morton	Admin Assistant	39
Jill Noble	Finance Officer	37
Joan Nuttall	Strategy Support Officer (Performance)	37
Godfrey Nzegwu	Environmental Protection Officer	29
Trevor Thorn	Principal Planning Officer	22
Douglas Turner	Category Operative	47
Charles Wheeldon	Highways Development Manager	38

Resources

Patricia Appleyard	Professional Officer, Legal Services	35
Julie Brierley	Assistant Area Manager	39
Carol Dearnley	Senior Transformation Project Manager	31
Simon Freeman	Assistant Finance Manager	23
Janet Gregory	HR Consultant	33
Amanda Hall	Finance Officer	39
Susan Harwood	Learning and Development Consultant	39

Graham Hudson	Senior Personnel Officer	38
Michael Kidder	Assistant Operations Controller, Transport and Facilities Management	38
Stephen Mills	Senior Transport Service Officer	31
Susan Priest	Finance Officer	32
Susan Rodgers	Assistant Finance Manager	25
Andrew Shallice	Cohesion Migration and Safety Officer	27
Diane Whitlock	Workforce Development Manager	36
Peter Wilson	Senior Transport Manager	39

(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. SCHOOL PLACES IN SHEFFIELD: PUBLICATION FEEDBACK

8.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report providing feedback following the publication of statutory proposals to change the number/organisation of school places in two areas across the City. It also sought permission to take the next steps in taking forward the proposals.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposal to increase the capacity at Hallam Primary School as described in the statutory proposals, in recognition of the concerns raised by local residents, this approval is conditional on the granting of planning permission before 1st November 2014;
- (b) approves the proposals to create a single primary school for Tinsley by closing Tinsley Nursery Infant School and extending the range of Tinsley Junior School, with a change to the timing stated in the published proposals to bring it forward to 1st September 2014 as requested by the two governing bodies;
- (c) agrees that the new through primary school building in Tinsley should be moved to a site away from the motorway; and

- (d) notes that a further report will be submitted to consider the different site options and that a decision will be made on the Site by July 2014.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

- 8.3.1 Providing sufficient primary school places is a statutory duty of the Council. This will mean that Sheffield children reaching primary school age in 2014 and beyond will continue to have a school place in the area of the City in which they live. In Tinsley the proposal would secure the single management, governance and leadership structure across the primary age-range.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 8.4.1 The consultation process and statutory notice period has allowed for alternative proposals to come forward. In the case of Tinsley the key alternatives were around the site and these are being considered fully before a further report back to Cabinet.

9. SHEFFIELD: AN INTERNATIONAL, COMPETITIVE, TRADING CITY

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report presenting a new International Trade and Export Strategy, which had been developed with key partners and the Local Enterprise Partnership, for approval by Cabinet.

9.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the new International Trade and Export Strategy appended to the main report as a statement of the City's trade and export priorities and ambitions;
- (b) notes the financial implications of implementing the strategy;
- (c) agrees that officers in Creative Sheffield will continue to work with the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership as part of the development of this wider export offer; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Director of Creative Sheffield to take such further steps, including the making of agreements or arrangements with third parties, as he considers appropriate to achieve the delivery of this Strategy, subject to (a) the availability of any necessary funding within a suitable approved Council budget, and (b) consultation as appropriate with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Finance.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

- 9.3.1 An International Trade and Export Strategy for Sheffield will launch a new international partnership and outline key strategic interventions designed to drive up export performance across Sheffield and the wider City Region.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 **Retain our current International Strategy**

The Council's current International Strategy is 2010 to 2013/14. There has been a need for a review to evaluate the Strategy's successes. Over the lifetime of this Strategy the national and international economic climate has changed considerably following the repercussions of the 2008 financial crisis. Whilst the current International Strategy had an economic focus, it has been concluded that a stronger, more explicit economic focus is required in a new Strategy. Hence the development of this International Trade Strategy which focuses and prioritises international economic activity for the economic wellbeing of the City as a whole.

9.4.2 **Delivering a Sheffield Strategy without SCR**

Developing a Sheffield Strategy in isolation from the SCRLEP Strategic Economic Plan may lead to increased impact through the improved coordination of existing resources and additional limited resources. However, this would achieve limited economic benefits to the scale and flexibility of current export support. The City could miss out on significant opportunities to truly transform Sheffield's, and its wider City region's economy through harnessing the SCR SEP to negotiate increased resources and co-commission powers for UKTI resources.

9.4.3 **Work purely within the framework of the SCR Strategic Economic Plan**

The development of the International Trade Strategy preceded the SCR Strategic Economic Plan, with Sheffield being asked to lead on the wider international business development offer as a result of more exports and trade being identified as a strategic City region priority. To not proceed with a clear Sheffield plan and a positive commitment to trade and export, and to further partnership working, would lead to a significant delay in activity starting, a move backwards in terms of the coordination and support we have in the trade organisations in the City region and a less bold and clear ask with the SEP for future resources and support. In the short-term we will formally establish and work with the SIP to make progress on delivering the Sheffield commitment up to April 2015 during the period of SCRLEP negotiations with Government on the Strategic Economic Plan. Through this approach, Sheffield will take the lead on initial delivery, evidencing a successful track record to Government, and demonstrating a willingness and ability to deliver on a larger City region scale.

10. **KEEP SHEFFIELD WORKING FUND: DRIVING THE LOCAL ECONOMY FORWARD**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Keep Sheffield Working Fund.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the economic impact and outcomes achieved through the Keep Sheffield Working Fund and its contribution toward the Competitive City strategic outcome;
- (b) notes the financial implications contained in this report; and
- (c) requests that consideration is given to the lessons learned from the fund in terms of the impact a locally managed, flexible fund can have on local growth and the implications this has for future innovation funds;

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The objective of the Keep Sheffield Working Fund was to help the Council do all it can to support activities that will help create jobs and drive the local economy forward. The success of the projects supported by the funds has demonstrated the value of a focused but flexible programme of activity which can invest in short term growth initiatives with long term impact.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 The option of using the £800,000 set aside for the Keep Sheffield Working Fund to support other activities has been considered. However, it was felt that investing in activities to create jobs and drive the local economy forward is essential to maintaining the City's competitiveness, as well as the prosperity and wellbeing of individuals and communities.

11. **MILTON STREET/PARKWAY CLOSE PROPERTY EXCHANGE**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Milton Street/Parkway Close Property Exchange.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposals to exchange the properties at Milton Street and Parkway Close and lease back the Milton Street property on the terms set out in the report; and
- (b) delegates authority to the Director of Capital and Major Projects to negotiate the detailed terms of the transactions and to instruct the Director of Legal and Governance to complete such legal documentation as is necessary or appropriate to give effect to the transaction.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 Officers consider that acquiring Eye Witness Works and subsequently marketing it together with neighbouring Council owned land through a development brief will be a significant way in which to partially rebalance the City Centre housing market and enhance the regeneration of the Devonshire Quarter.

- 11.3.2 Exchanging this property for Council owned premises at Parkway Close will enable a high quality local manufacturing company to relocate to more suitable more modern premises. This should assist the future viability of that business and protect local jobs.
- 11.3.3 Allowing the company to remain in the existing premises under a temporary leaseback will minimise holding costs and reduce the risk to the Council.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4.1 The Council could simply sell the Parkway Close property on the open market and not do anything to assist Taylors Eye Witness Ltd to sell their property and hence relocate the business and protect jobs. This approach would not achieve any of the Council's objectives in terms of either the Economic or Housing Strategies or the regeneration of the City Centre.
- 11.4.2 Officers have tried other initiatives to seek to help facilitate the redevelopment of Eye Witness Works by private developers but the proposals put forward have either been unacceptable in planning terms due to the amount of demolition of the listed building proposed or not been sufficiently valuable to enable the company to acquire new property and relocate.

12. **SCRUTINY REVIEW**

- 12.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report providing background information on key functions of scrutiny, the model operated in Sheffield and how Scrutiny is resourced.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the findings of the Scrutiny Review and agrees changes to the ways of working, including:
- The development of a more rigorous approach to work planning and prioritisation, including an annual Scrutiny planning event
 - Greater engagement with the public and service users in Scrutiny
 - Strengthening outcome focussed Scrutiny of City-wide issues including holding to account services delivered by other agencies across the City, as well as the changes;
- (b) agrees changes in time for the start of the next municipal year in relation to changing membership for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to reflect proportionality of Council, whilst including Chairs and Deputy Chairs of Scrutiny Committees; and
- (c) agrees that in consultation with the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, officers further develop a detailed action plan based on the proposed solutions to issues identified in the Review as outlined in Section 8 of the report.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 12.3.1 This report on the Scrutiny Review identifies a series of recommendations which would enable the Council to improve the impact and effectiveness of Scrutiny, within a changing context of substantial changes in budgets and new ways of working and service delivery; changes in people's expectations of local democracy and the new development of new forms of technology and communications. Scrutiny needs to adapt to these changes, to ensure local government and other organisations are accountable, help build trust with the public, and improve the effectiveness of Council services and the work of other agencies.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 During the course of the Review, different approaches to structures and ways of working were raised by participants in the Review. In considering these it was felt that there are a range of solutions, as outlined in Section 8 of the report, that could improve the effectiveness and impact of Overview and Scrutiny. Overall, the current structure of the committees was felt to be 'fit for purpose', though a stronger approach to co-ordination and better focus on issues that matter, including corporate health, could not be achieved without making changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.

13. **ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING SCRUTINY AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: CYCLING INQUIRY REPORT**

- 13.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report in relation to the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Cycling Inquiry.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) thanks the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee for its work on the Cycling Inquiry;
- (b) notes the Cycling Inquiry report; and
- (c) requests a detailed response to the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee's Cycling Inquiry report from the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development at the July 2014 Cabinet meeting.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 The Committee's Cycling Inquiry report makes 19 recommendations. The Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development is asked to respond to the Committee's Cycling Inquiry report in three months' time as this would provide the Cabinet Member and the services with time to develop a detailed response.

13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 13.4.1 Do nothing with the Committee's Cycling Inquiry report. However, given the time and effort spent by the Committee's Inquiry and contributions to the Inquiry from members of the public and other organisations this was not deemed a viable option.
- 13.4.2 Respond to the Committee's Cycling Inquiry report over a much longer timescale. However, this would be at the risk of losing some of the momentum from the Inquiry.

14. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2013/14 (MONTH 10) AS AT 31/1/14

14.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the Month 10 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme for January.

14.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the 2013/14 Revenue budget position;
- (b) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
 - (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme and procurement strategies listed in Appendix 1 of the report, and delegates authority to the Director of Commercial Services, or an Officer nominated by him, to award the necessary contracts, on such terms as the Director or nominated Officer shall agree, following stage approval by the Capital Programme Group;
 - (ii) approves the proposed variations and slippage in Appendix 1;
 - (iii) notes the variations to the programme executed under delegated authorities or emergency approval, and notes the latest position on the Capital Programme including the current level of delivery and forecasting performance; and
 - (iv) approves the acceptance of grants listed in Appendix 2 to the report, and, in doing so, approves the Council assuming the role of Accountable Body for those grants, noting the conditions of the grants.

14.3 Reasons for Decision

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

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 14.4.1 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 Revenue Budget and Capital Programme.