

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 18 March 2015 by the Cabinet.

Date notified to all members: Wednesday 26 March 2015

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Tuesday 31 March 2015

The decision can be implemented from Monday 1 April 2015

Item No

8. CORPORATE PLAN 2015-18

8.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report outlining the Corporate Plan 2015-18 which set out the Council's direction and priorities for the next three years and how the Council would go about achieving them.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves and adopts the Corporate Plan 2015-18 as appended to the report, noting that implementation of the Plan will be subject to approval of the Council's budget and that individual aspects of the Plan will be subject to a robust appraisal, including a financial appraisal and impact assessment prior to implementation;
- (b) directs that any substantial changes to the direction or priorities within the Corporate Plan need to be brought back to Cabinet for approval, but delegates authority to the Chief Executive to make amendments to the Corporate Plan considered appropriate, in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 To approve the Corporate Plan for 2015-18.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 An alternative would be to not have a Corporate Plan. This would lead to a lack of direction and clarity of the organisation's priorities for the next three years, undermining the delivery of our long-term ambitions.

8.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

8.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

8.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

John Mothersole, Chief Executive

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

9. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2014/15 MONTH 9 (AS AT 31/12/14)

9.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the Month 9 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme for December.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report on the 2014/15 Revenue budget position;
- (b) approves the use of £121k of Public Health forecast reduction in spend, as noted in paragraph 8 of Appendix 2 of the report;
- (c) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
 - (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 4.1, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;
 - (ii) approves the proposed variations and slippage in Appendix 4.1 of the report; and notes
- (d) the latest position on the Capital Programme; and
- (e) the slippage requests authorised by the Cabinet Member for Finance under his delegated authority.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 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.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 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 and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

8.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

8.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

8.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Eugene Walker, Interim Executive Director, Resources

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

10. DEFERRED PAYMENT SCHEME (THE CARE ACT)

10.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report seeking approval to implement a Deferred Payment Scheme in Sheffield to meet the requirements of the Care Act, which provides for interest and administration costs to be charged and treated in the same way as the deferred amount, to replace the existing loan schemes on offer. The report also sought delegated authority for the Executive Director, Communities to make operational decisions to allow the scheme to run.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report;
- (b) approves the implementation of a Deferred Payment Scheme in Sheffield, which provides for interest and administration costs to be charged and treated in the same way as the deferred amount, to replace the existing loan schemes on offer;
- (c) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Communities to make operational decisions in order to put the scheme in place; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Interim Director of Care and Support in her capacity as the Council's Statutory Director of Social Services to instruct Legal Services to complete the necessary documentation and register charges at the Land Registry.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 Meets the requirements of the Care Act 2014.
- 10.3.2 1st April 2015 timescales can be achieved by giving the Executive Director, Communities the delegated authority to implement the policy and systems required to run the scheme.
- 10.3.3 The Department of Health are issuing national information sheets and contract templates to promote national consistency in the running of the scheme. The Social Care Accounts Service has the subject matter expertise to tailor these documents to meet local requirements and to ensure that any financial or legal concerns are addressed.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 The Council could continue to run its existing schemes. This would leave the Council open for legal challenge for failing to meet the requirements set out in the Care Act and failing to offer people a Deferred Payment Agreement they are entitled to under statute.

Where new Personal Capital and Recovery Loans are set up changes to legislation would leave the Council exposed to non-payers, increasing the risk of uncollectable debt.

- 10.4.2 The Council could contract a third party to run the scheme on the Council's behalf. The setting up and running of the scheme is very closely linked to the in-house services which co-ordinate individual financial assessments, payments to care homes, bad debts to care homes and assessments of clients care and support needs. It is believed that a successful Deferred Payment Scheme must be integrated with these and the systems they use. It would not therefore be advisable for this to be outsourced to a third party organisation. The timescales involved for tendering this activity does not make it viable for this to be in place by 1st April 2015 when the Care Act becomes law.

10.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

10.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

10.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Communities

10.8 **Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In**

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care

11. **PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES IN SOUTH WEST SHEFFIELD**

11.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report outlining the issue and details the response to the consultation on a proposal to increase pupil places at Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools which finished on 11 February 2015.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes that a single extra Reception class is being offered at Dobcroft Infant School in September 2015 and that an extra class will be provided at Dobcroft Junior when this year group transfers to Year 3 in September 2018;
- (b) agrees that the proposals to permanently expand Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools from 2016 should be put on hold by formally withdrawing them allowing officers time to review and explore all options for future school places expansion in the South West of the City, including the Dobcroft plans and other suggested in the consultation process. Following this process a further consultation will take place; and
- (c) anticipates a further report (to Cabinet or Individual Cabinet Member) on the expansion of primary school places in the South West of the City to propose a further 4-week consultation on providing places by September 2016.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 The level of concern in response to the proposal to permanently expand Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools from Dobcroft parents and residents has clearly been high. The City Council needs further time to explore in more depth all options for providing extra primary school places in this part of the City.

11.3.2 A number of concerns have come forward during the consultation from the Dobcroft school community about the potential implications of expansion. There were also several alternative proposals for the expansion of school places across the area and beyond. At present a viable and positive alternative option to Dobcroft remains unconfirmed. Some parents asked the Council to extend the consultation period to consider such options in more detail. Under the statutory process the Council is not able to do this and so a pause is the way to allow a further period to explore all options further. This will help shape the right long term solution for the area.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

11.4.1 The recommendation is to allow a further consideration of the alternative options to add places. Officers believed that extra places remained a requirement from September 2016 and that doing nothing is not therefore a viable option.

11.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

11.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

11.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Children, Young People and Family Support

12. HOUSING EMPLOYABILITY AND APPRENTICE SCHEME

12.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report in relation to the Housing Employability and Apprentice Scheme.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the establishment of a Housing Employability and Apprentice Scheme within the Council Housing Service;
- (b) delegates authority to the Director of Housing to pay bursaries or hardship support if necessary subject to the agreed criteria; and
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Interim Director of Finance to carry out work to develop a garden assistance scheme as described in the report.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 The changes described in the report will deliver many of the Council's and Housing services commitment, visions and strategic objectives.

12.3.2 They also provide continuity and an improvement to services for Council tenants and are based on the views of tenants and staff.

12.3.3 The recommendations will improve the offer to Council tenants in respect of employment and the quality of neighbourhoods.

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 Alternative options were considered for all elements of the project, including no change, which is not a viable option for any of the elements as it does not meet the needs of the service or the needs of the customers we serve.

12.4.2 The main alternative for the apprenticeship model was to keep with the work experience in the building trade background. This does not prove a viable option

as we do not have the skills to develop and contribute to the learners.

- 12.4.3 Four options were considered for the charged gardening scheme, with the chosen option being the only one that initially maintains and potentially subsequently enhances the service provision without additional cost to the Council Housing Service. This will be addressed more fully as the scheme is developed.

12.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

12.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

12.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Communities

12.8 **Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In**

Safer and Stronger Communities

13. CARE HOME MARKET AND FEES ANALYSIS 2015/16

- 13.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report in relation to the Care Home Market and Fees Analysis 2015/16.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the market analysis;
- (b) confirms a 2.33% increase in Residential Care home fees for 2015/16; and
- (c) confirms a 2.45% increase in Nursing Home fees for 2015/16.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 There has been a “freeze” in Care Home fees for the last two years. During this time we know that the cost of running a Care Home has increased.

- 13.3.2 This year the National Minimum Wage rose by 3% and inflation by 1.2%. Together these cost drivers create an estimated 2.33% cost pressure for care home providers.

- 13.3.3 In previous years, there has been sufficient confidence that the market would continue to develop and deliver modern, efficient accommodation to replace the capacity lost as less efficient care homes have closed. This confidence, coupled with the Council’s challenging financial position, meant that fees have not been increased for the last 2 years.

- 13.3.4 This year there has been further unplanned closures and there are a limited number of new care home developments at the planning stage. However, there is still capacity in care homes and providers tell us that they are benefiting from increased occupancy levels.
- 13.3.5 Our view is that the care home market is now in a stable position, with sufficient capacity for the short- to medium-term. However, we believe that given the cost pressures providers are under, there is a risk that a further fee freeze could destabilise the market and lead to unplanned closures. These closures would reduce choice for people in Sheffield needing to move into a care home, and increase the risks of capacity falling below demand.
- 13.3.6 Following consultation with providers, we have also acknowledged that staffing cost pressures for nursing homes are a particular challenge as staff costs inevitably form a greater proportion of overall costs in homes that have greater levels of staffing.
- 13.3.7 The recommendation this year is therefore for a rise of 2.33% in residential home care fees and an increase of 2.45% in the fee for nursing homes. These increases are based on a consistent calculation of increased costs given that inflation is at 1.2% and staff costs have risen by 3%.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

13.4.1

There were three options considered:

- Freeze the fee level for a third year
- Increase fees by 1.75% to partially off-set cost pressures on providers
- Increase fees by 2.33% and 2.45% for residential and nursing respectively based on estimated rises in provider costs

13.4.2

Consideration of the three options regarding fees 2015/16 was undertaken taking into account the following;

- Market factors as described in this report
- Costs of care as calculated in the report
- Provider feedback from engagement events & planned consultation
- The financial position of the Council.

13.4.3

Each option was risk assessed as summarised below. Detailed risk assessments are included on the following pages. The summary position is as follows:

Freeze the fee level for a third year

- Risk of unplanned exits from the Market and of legal challenge

Increase fees by 1.75% to partially off-set cost pressures on providers whilst

recognising Council's financial position

- Reduces risk of further unplanned exits and legal challenge – but still a real terms reduction in fee at a time when the market is finely balanced

Increase fees by 2.33% and 2.45% for residential and nursing respectively based on estimated rises in provider costs

- Should stabilise market but increases risks on Council social care budgets.

The additional 0.18% (2.45%) reflected the additional staff costs faced by Nursing homes

13.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

13.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

13.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Communities

13.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care

14. FUTURESHPERS - A YOUTH ENGAGEMENT FUND PROJECT

14.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report setting out how the Futureshapers project would work and recommending that, should the bid prove successful, the City Council adopts the role of local contributor and, as such, makes an invest to save financial contribution of £455,254 for each year of the three year project (April 2015 to March 2018 inclusive) from youth budgets, making a total contribution of £1,365,762

14.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) endorses Sheffield City Council as the local contributor of the Futureshapers programme;
- (b) resolves that the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families and the Executive Director, Resources agree the appropriate financial profile and payment mechanism to allow the council to makes an invest to save financial contribution of £455,254 for each year of the three year project (April 2015 to March 2018 inclusive) from youth budgets, making a total contribution of £1,365,762;

- (c) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Family Services in consultation with the Executive Director, Resources and the Director of Legal and Governance to take all such necessary steps to ensure that SCC's contribution is legally safeguarded including placing a charge on the ring-fenced bank account and negotiating and entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with Futureshapers and that the outcomes are properly and appropriately assessed prior to the outcomes payments being made; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Family Services be authorised to recommend, in liason with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Family Services, a suitable candidate to assist the Board of Futureshapers properly to manage public funds and services.

14.3 Reasons for Decision

- 14.3.1 The Futureshapers project will, if the bid is successful, make a significant contribution towards the achievement of SCC's strategic outcomes for vulnerable and disadvantaged young people. It will help over 1300 young people make a successful progression from school into the world of further education, training and employment, as well as building their resilience and confidence.
- 14.3.2 The Futureshapers project will, by bringing in new funding of over £3m initial investment from social investors and over £4m from DWP for outcome payments, deliver considerable added value to the 25% investment the council makes for the payment of outcomes. For the councils' investment, 100% of the return will be achieved in delivery and overall outcomes payments. This represents a high value use of council investment.
- 14.3.3 The successful delivery of the Futureshapers programme would result in lower demand for more intensive interventions with young people who are NEET. This will enable the City Council to make further year on year savings over the next three years against targeted youth support budgets, in anticipation of further public sector savings, whilst maintaining an effective system of support for young people progressing from school into adulthood.
- 14.3.4 Futureshapers allows SCC to test the Social Impact Bond financial model, build a relationship with a network of potential social investors, and position Sheffield as a council and a city that can deliver significant improvement in outcomes using external investment in its services. As such, it is intended that this new investment model will allow SCC to build a sustainable funding model for targeted youth support at a time when the resources available to the council continue to diminish and it will provide the evidence base for continuing dialogue with government as to new risk and reward arrangements through which youth services can be made sustainable.

14.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 14.4.1 Sheffield City Council (SCC) is not eligible to submit a bid to the YEF, which is primarily aimed at charitable and private organisations acting as the contractor and delivery agent.
- 14.4.2 SCC has not been approached by other bidders to the YEF, but is supporting this submission in partnership with Sheffield Futures, the city's leading youth charity.
- 14.4.3 SCC could decline to act as the local commissioner to the bid, but to do so would be to deny the city the potential to access to £3m of external funding for targeted youth support. This would be inconsistent with its strategy of negotiating deals with government designed to secure sustainable financial arrangements that are capable of delivering better outcomes.
- 14.4.4 SCC has discussed with DWP the technical arrangements for the payment of the contribution to outcome payments, and has proposed alternative arrangements that give more financial oversight to the release of outcome payments. DWP has made it clear that it is not in a position to change the financial rules set out in the programme prospectus, and that any change to the financial arrangements would invalidate the Sheffield bid.

14.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

14.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

14.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families

14.8 **Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In**

Children, Young People and Family Support

15. TACKLING POVERTY STRATEGY

15.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report in relation to the Tackling Poverty Strategy.

15.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) endorses the vision for tackling poverty in the City;
- (b) approves the Needs Assessment;
- (c) approves the City's Tackling Poverty Strategy, developed in partnership with other stakeholders in the City;

- (d) approves the Strategic Outcomes, noting that any activities or actions developed in future under the broad headings of the strategic programmes will need to be dealt with, case by case, as new decisions in their own right;
- (e) approves the actions in the strategic programmes in the Action Plan to which the Council has committed, within existing resources;
- (f) endorses the strategy and refer it to the Sheffield Executive Board, the Local Enterprise Partnership, the Combined Authority and to the local Equality Hub Network for their consideration; and
- (g) asks partners to review and report on progress on an annual basis.

15.3 Reasons for Decision

15.3.1 The purpose of the report is to seek endorsement and approval, from Cabinet, for the Needs Assessment, the Tackling Poverty Strategy (which incorporates the Child Poverty Strategy) and the associated Action Plan. In particular, this report seeks Cabinet endorsement for:

- the vision
- the strategic programmes
- the initial commitments made by the Council for the actions that fall within its areas of responsibility.

15.3.2 Approving and implementing the Tackling Poverty Strategy will provide a clear, city-wide focus on reducing Child Poverty and household poverty and inequalities, in line with the Council's Corporate Plan commitments, and the recommendations set out in the Fairness Commission report. The strategy is also a statutory document under the Child Poverty Act (2010).

15.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

15.4.1 An alternative option would have been to develop a strategy just focused on children and young people. We took a conscious decision not to do that as we believe that we cannot tackle poverty for children without tackling poverty and building resilience in individuals, families and the communities in which they live. With this in mind, with increasing concerns over widening poverty in the City and in the light of the evidence set out by the Fairness Commission, we have therefore chosen to broaden our approach. Whilst the Tackling Poverty Strategy (2015-18) will incorporate the statutory Child Poverty Strategy it will be encompassed within a strategic approach and document designed to tackle all-age poverty.

15.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

15.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

15.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families

15.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

16. FUTURE OPTIONS FOR THE HOUSING REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE

16.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report in relation to future options for the Housing Repairs and Maintenance Service.

16.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposal in this paper to insource the Housing Repairs and Maintenance (HR&M) Service from 1st April 2017;
- (b) gives its approval for the insourcing to be done based on the principles and assumptions described in Section 9.4 of this report, and taking into account the risks and mitigations as set out in Section 10, including the potential contracting-out of a small proportion of the service;
- (c) gives its approval for the budget required to cover the one-off implementation and set-up costs, as described in Section 8.3 of this report;
- (d) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Communities to take all the necessary steps to progress and implement the insourcing of the service, in consultation with the Cabinet Member. These steps will include:
 - at the appropriate time, commencing formal consultation with Trade Unions regarding the transfer of staff from Kier into the Council (in consultation with the Director of Human Resources as necessary).
 - developing the structure and agreeing the timescales needed to deliver an in-house repairs service (in consultation with the Director of Human Resources as necessary).
 - approving the procurement strategy and contract award, and agreeing contract terms and entering into the contracts, for all necessary goods and services. This will apply to both the development / implementation work required prior to the insourcing, and for in-house delivery of the Service itself (including any elements of the Service which it is agreed will be contracted out by the Council) once it is brought back into the Council (in consultation with the Director of Commercial Services and the Director of Legal

and Governance as necessary).

- undertaking a more detailed assessment of which elements of the Service are more appropriate to be contracted out, rather than directly delivered by the Council, and what the impact of this will be and how that will need to be managed (in consultation with the Director of Commercial Services and the Director of Human Resources as necessary).
 - Ensuring that the statutory leaseholder consultation required by Section 20 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (as amended by the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002) is adhered to.
 - Any other work required for the effective preparation for and implementation of the insourcing of the HR&M Service; and
- (e) requests that a further report is presented to Cabinet if the underlying strategy for the future of the Service cannot be achieved, or if any unforeseen significant risks emerge which may prompt Cabinet to re-consider its decision.

16.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 16.3.1 Insourcing the HR&M Service will give the Council more control, flexibility and accountability in managing the Service, enabling the service to be fully integrated into the Council and to work in close partnership with other relevant key Council services. This will help to transform its approach to one which is more holistic, joined-up and outcome-focused and ensure that the Service is delivered in a way which fully supports the Council's corporate objectives.
- 16.3.2 Bringing the HR&M Service in-house for direct delivery by the Council will also help to bring about an alignment of culture in the Service to that of the Council, and in its approach to customers. As an integrated function within the Council, the Service will be much better placed to adopt the Council's key principles of 'right first time' and holistic service delivery - and to be more adaptable to varying circumstances and to any changes in corporate priorities.
- 16.3.3 Based on all information known to date, and after the initial upfront costs of transferring the Service, the insourced option is expected to generate sustainable year-on-year revenue savings. In addition, once fully integrated into the Council there will be further opportunities to reduce duplication, join-up procurement with other Council Services and increase efficiency within the Service – enabling it to achieve more and improve outcomes within the same

level of spending.

- 16.3.4 Under this option, there is huge potential for the HR&M Service to help support and strengthen the Housing+ approach, which focuses on tailoring our Services to help achieve better outcomes for our tenants. HR&M staff would be out on estates and in tenants' homes on a daily basis, and so would be ideally placed to identify problems with tenancies or additional support needs. Strong links with the local Neighbourhood Teams (due to be implemented later this year under the Housing+ roll-out) would enable the HR&M Service to refer any such issues to the appropriate Neighbourhood Team staff, enabling these issues to be dealt with earlier.
- 16.3.5 Insourcing the Service will also make it easier to structure the Service around the proposed 7 Neighbourhood Areas (currently awaiting the outcomes of the Electoral Ward Boundaries Review before being confirmed). This would enable the Service to be delivered in-line with the new Neighbourhood-based approach (again part of the roll-out of the Housing+ model), with staff potentially based in a particular Neighbourhood. This would increase local knowledge for HR&M staff, and improve their links with the local community.
- 16.3.6 It is clear from in-depth consultation with tenants and leaseholders that the Repairs and Maintenance Service is for customers one of the most important elements of housing management. Insourcing the Service will put it in a stronger position in terms of its ability to deliver the customer vision for the Service. The Service will be directly linked into the Council housing governance and engagement framework (as all other key Council Housing Services are), enabling greater transparency and accountability. It would also enable tenants and leaseholders to more easily have direct influence on how the service is shaped and delivered in the future.
- 16.3.7 Potential insourcing was part of the Council's vision for the service in April 2013, and a requirement to prepare the Service for this was incorporated into the current contract with the new provider from April 2014. This preparation work has been taking place over the last few months, and will continue for the duration of the contract. This work should mean that the Service, and its workforce, are fit-for-purpose at the point of transfer - and that the Council will inherit the foundations of a modern and efficient Service on which it can build even further.
- 16.3.8 Insourcing also brings with it the potential to run the Service as an externally-trading Council function in the future – for example undertaking repairs and maintenance work on behalf of other social landlords.
- 16.3.9 Directly delivering the service in-house, with minor elements of it being outsourced to locally-based contractors wherever possible, would help support the concept of the 'Sheffield Brand'. Materials would be purchased from local suppliers wherever possible (subject of course to the usual procurement rules and Council policies), and the workforce would be predominantly local.
- 16.3.10 Sheffield would not be alone in insourcing a key service such as the HR&M

Service Independent research by APSE (the Association for Public Service Excellence) has also identified a number of potential benefits of insourcing services, based on actual case-studies and local authority experiences:

- o Improved performance
- o Stronger links to corporate strategic objectives
- o Greater flexibility, and more responsive to local and national policy changes
- o Efficiency savings
- o Improved customer satisfaction
- o Enhanced local supply chains
- o Better integration and joining-up with other relevant key services
- o New development and employment opportunities for the city

16.3.11 There are of course risks associated with the option to insource the Service (as indeed there are with the other two alternative delivery options discussed in this report), and some of these risks are significant. However, measures are and will continue to be in place to mitigate these risks, and if any of these risks significantly escalate, or any significant new risks (including financial ones) emerge, a further report would be brought back to Cabinet before progressing the transfer any further.

16.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

16.4.1 The alternatives considered are as described in Section 7 of the report.

16.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

16.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

16.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Communities

16.8 **Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In**

Safer and Stronger Communities

17. **UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD CAMPUS - SHEFFIELD CITY REGION INVESTMENT FUND**

17.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval in principle for the proposed University of Sheffield Campus Phase 1 project.

17.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) confirms its in principle support for the University of Sheffield Campus Phase 1 Scheme as described in this report, subject to:-
 - (i) the completion of a further detailed public consultation exercise about the Traffic Regulation Order proposals, and overall University Campus Master Plan proposals which may affect the highways the proper consideration of the results and where appropriate resolution of objections of such consultation in the course of making the final decision whether or not to proceed with the scheme; and
 - (ii) all necessary planning permissions, Traffic Regulation Orders and any other required regulatory approvals or consents being obtained by the University of Sheffield;
- (b) notes that the public consultation exercise referred to in (1) (a) above has already commenced;
- (c) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Place, in consultation with the Director of Regeneration and Development , the Director of Finance, the Director of Legal and Governance, the Director of Commercial Services and the Assistant Director - Capital & Major Projects to conclude on such terms as he considers appropriate and authorise the completion of a funding agreement between the Council and the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority in relation to the SCRIF funding for the Scheme provided that any such funding agreement shall be conditional on a final decision to proceed with the Scheme being made on the part of the Council;
- (d) delegates authority to the Cabinet Highways Committee to consider the results of the public consultation exercise referred to above, and having done so, if they are of the view that the Scheme will be of benefit to the public and it has been possible to overcome any valid objections decide to confirm the Council's final approval for the Scheme to be implemented;
- (e) if the Cabinet Highways Committee does confirm the Council's final approval for the Scheme , the Executive Director, Place shall be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills & Development, the Director of Regeneration and Development , the Director of Finance, the Director of Legal and Governance, the Director of Commercial Services and the Assistant Director - Capital & Major Projects:-
 - (i) to authorise on such terms as he considers appropriate the completion of an agreement pursuant to section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 with the University of Sheffield, together with such additional agreement(s) with the University that he may consider appropriate; and
 - (ii) generally to take such further steps, including (without limitation) entering into such further agreements and or arrangements with such parties and on such terms as he may consider appropriate, and approving detailed designs and materials to secure the successful

delivery of the works at no net cost to the Council and in line with the provisions of this report and to protect the Council's interests in this matter.

17.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 17.3.1 To enable work on the project to continue, pending the Council being in a position to give final approval for the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders.
- 17.3.2 To enable the Council to secure funding for the project from SCRIF.
- 17.3.3 To enable matters to be progressed as appropriate in an efficient way following the conclusion of the planned public consultation exercise on the highway implications of the University Campus Master Plan.

17.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 17.4.1 **Do nothing** – The UoS could be left to carry out public realm and road safety improvements as and when development occurs on the campus. This would not require additional public funding or Council involvement. However, serious concerns have been raised regarding safety at the current pedestrian crossings close to Brook Hill junction which require immediate action. The campus environment also seriously lags behind some of its major competitors and requires urgent and comprehensive intervention.
- 17.4.2 **UoS applies directly to the combined authority for SCRIF funding** – SCC would avoid direct involvement in submitting the business case and delivering the outputs and outcomes. However, the UoS may not be eligible to apply directly as the UoS cluster is only a sub project of the Councils overall SCRIF City Centre Programme. The UoS has no experience of submitting bids for Department for Transport or City Region funding or of creating high quality public realm to the standard achieved elsewhere in the City Centre. This approach would see the Councils influence on consistency of the overall programme weakened.
- 17.4.3 **SCC acts as facilitator, regulator and accountable body** – but all design, procurement, delivery and liability for cost overruns is the responsibility of the UoS. The Council would retain control of the overall SCRIF City Centre Programme and of the UoS element and would be in a strong position to drive the programme and quality, ensuring integration with other programmes e.g. Streets Ahead. However, due to the risks associated with co-ordinating these works on the strategic transport network a Council lead is deemed to be a better option.
- 17.4.4 **The preferred option is SCC acts as lead body on delivery of Highways works, facilitator, regulator and accountable body** – but initial design up to tender, liability for cost overruns and delivery of non-highway works (Arts Tower & Red Hill) are the responsibility of the UoS. It is intended the appointment of the Design Team will be assigned or novated as appropriate to the Council who will procure a contractor for the Highways works and manage/supervise the programme ensuring quality and integration with other programmes e.g. Streets Ahead.

17.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

17.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

17.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

17.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

18. THE GRAVES PARK CHARITABLE TRUST: COBNAR COTTAGE

18.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report summarising public objections to the proposed sale for residential use of Cobnar Cottage which adjoins the boundary wall of Graves Park.

18.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet acting as Charity Trustees:-

(a) notes the objections received, but for the reasons set out in this report, delegates authority to the Director of Legal and Governance to make an application to the Charity Commission for a scheme to give the Trustee the power to dispose of the freehold interest in Cobnar Cottage and to invest the capital receipt in improving the facilities in Graves Park, rather than holding it as a permanent endowment and just applying the income to the charitable objects; and

(b) if an appropriate scheme is made by the Charity Commission following the application, confirms its authority to proceed with the disposal in accordance with the recommendations approved following the report to Cabinet on July 17 2013.

18.3 Reasons for Decision

18.3.1 The disposal of this surplus property on the open market would convert a current liability into an asset for the benefit of the Charity and therefore park users. It would also start a process that will lead to the cottage being restored to residential use and provide a significant investment fund for the charity to improve the park.

18.3.2 The objections raised to the disposal principally focus on the Council's legal right to sell the cottage, but a successful application for a scheme would deal with this issue, as set out in this report. The only alternative proposal to disposal put forward is demolition and creation of memorial garden put forward by the

Friends of Graves Park, but this cannot be considered to be in the best interests of the charity for the reasons outlined in this report.

18.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

18.4.1 The empty property is now surplus to the Council's and Charity's requirements and is an on-going liability to the Charity. A significant investment of at least £100,000 would be required to bring the property back into a habitable standard. The charity has no funds for this and even if funding were made available it has no productive use for the property. It may be possible to let the property, but the rental income would not be as beneficial to charity as the capital receipt obtained by selling the property. The Friends Group proposal requires a smaller investment of £23,400, but would create an on-going maintenance liability and not generate any possibility of deriving an income. It would also preclude any capital receipt to invest in improving the park.

18.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

18.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

18.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

18.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing