

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 18 March 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Leigh Bramall, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Isobel Bowler, Ben Curran, Harry Harpham (Deputy Chair), Mazher Iqbal and Mary Lea

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 The Chair reported that appendices 3, 5 and 6 for agenda item 17 'Future Options for the Housing Repairs and Maintenance Service' and Appendix G for agenda item 18 'University of Sheffield Campus – Sheffield City Region Investment Fund' were not available to the public and press because they contained exempt information described in Paragraphs 3 (agenda item 17) and 5 (agenda item 18) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and if Members wished to discuss these appendices the public and press would need to be excluded from the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2015 were approved as a correct record subject to the addition of the words 'cut to the' in the second paragraph of section 5.2 to read 'Councillor Iqbal confirmed that the rumours referred to by Mr Simpkin were not true and there would be no 15% cut to the grant to Healthwatch'.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of Public Questions

Martin Brighton asked when did political pragmatism, damage limitation or any other factor have influence or control over answers to citizen's questions that require factual answers?

Councillor Julie Dore, Leader of the Council, replied that it didn't.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Council Policy

Martin Brighton asked what Council policy condones the suppression of

documents, or their distribution once released, on the grounds that they contain Council-created information that would be embarrassing for senior Elected Members and/or senior Council officers? If no such policy exists, what policy ensures that no suppression takes place?

Councillor Julie Dore responded that there was no such policy and the Council's Code of Conduct policy ensured that no suppression took place.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Whistleblowing Policy

Martin Brighton commented that the Council's whistleblowing policy provides protection to Council employees who whistleblow. What Council policy exists to protect citizens who might whistleblow to expose inappropriate Council practices?

Councillor Dore commented that the Council held many engagement activities with the public where they could raise whistleblowing and if an issue was raised the Council would direct them to the complaints procedures to follow.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Council Policies

Martin Brighton asked what measures ensure that all Council policies and the internal and external reports demonstrating compliance (or otherwise) with those policies, are freely available, and that citizens know from where they can be obtained?

Councillor Dore responded that the Council website contained all the policies of the Council. If there was a report that Mr Brighton did not believe was available on the website he should let the Council know and this would be provided.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Compliance with Policies

Martin Brighton asked, given recent developments, what systems are in place to ensure that policies are applied and what are the consequences for Elected Members and officers if policies are not complied with?

Councillor Dore replied that for Members there was a Code of Conduct that they had to follow and for officers as well as their own Code of Conduct there were many employment policies and practices which needed to be followed.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Complaints

Martin Brighton asked what procedures ensure that any Elected Members or officers dealing with complaints are not in any way associated with the complaint issue or, if applicable, the person(s) being complained about?

Councillor Dore replied that the Council always aimed to ensure that people subject to a complaint were not the people investigating the complaint. If Mr Brighton was aware of a situation where this was the case he should raise it with the portfolio concerned.

5.7 Public Question in respect of Inspections

Martin Brighton asked do internal or external inspections of Council functions go any deeper than the surface or cosmetic appearance and do internal and external inspectors ensure that any claims of compliance are supported by evidence, rather than trustingly accepting claims at face value?

Councillor Dore responded that any member of the public could read inspections if they had been posted on the website and often went much deeper into the service itself. If Mr Brighton had evidence that this was not the case he should raise it with the service concerned.

5.8 Public Question in respect of Devonshire Street Planning Application

Nigel Slack commented that the date for the planning meeting to decide the fate of the Devonshire Street parade, the oldest remaining retail parade in the City Centre, was set for next Tuesday and it would appear that officers were recommending demolition. This despite the fact that it was opposed by some 19,500 members of the public that were concerned enough to actually object and probably ten times as many that didn't.

Without prejudicing that decision, would the Council explain what contingencies will be in place to ensure that if the demolition takes place, the traders, that are such an integral part of the City's independent shopping offer, will not be lost to the City and that the heritage value of the location is better protected in the future than in the present?

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, commented that no one disputed that this was a sensitive issue. National Planning Policy was set by the Government and there was very little local discretion. Councillor Bramall had consistently argued for increased devolution where local Councils could set more of their own priorities.

When officers put forward a recommendation to Members this was based on national policy guidelines. Given that the building was privately owned and the owners have made an application officers had to put a recommendation forward on that basis. Councillors then had to pay attention to National Planning Policy. An applicant could appeal if a decision to refuse was against National Planning Policy. If their appeal was successful they could be awarded costs which were often significant for the Council.

Councillor Bramall recognised that objections and the views of people were important but it was also crucial that these objections were based on planning policy and non-material conditions could not be considered in law. People could attend the meeting at the Town Hall on the 24th and put their objections to the Committee in person or they could email their objections in.

Officers often spoke to applicants prior to the submission of their application as it was important any applications complied with the law and met the design standards required by the Council. There was no suggestion that officers

'colluded' with developers and, in fact, many developers would argue the exact opposite.

Independent shops were a difficult issue for the Council. They could be good or bad shops and the term independent shops covered a whole spectrum of shops. It was more of an issue of market failure rather than a planning failure. The Council had done a lot of good work in respect of independent shops such as the Chapel Walk scheme where 30/40 independent shops were encouraged to become involved. The Council were currently working on a more holistic system and would help businesses as far as they could to seek premises.

The original application for this site at Devonshire Green had been for all bar or restaurant use. This had now been scaled down and the majority use would be shops.

5.9 Public Question in respect of Confidential Information

Nigel Slack referred to items 17 and 18 on the agenda for the meeting which included information excluded from the press and public by virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information. Mr Slack commented that he had asked before that this should be expanded upon to at least identify which 'person' the information related to and a more specific comment on the type of information, as 'business affairs' can conceivably cover a multitude of omissions.

With regard to item 18, Mr Slack remained unhappy that a publicly funded body was accorded such protection just because it failed to fall into one of the exemption conditions. He also struggled to see what information may be restricted considering the amount of financial information the appendices did contain. Could the Council expand on this decision?

Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance, responded that the legislation provided the Council with a limited number of exemption categories. The wording used was the wording in the legislation. Item 17 contained exempt information as it related to business affairs of Kier, the Council's sub-contractor. The exemption for item 18 was incorrect on the agenda, it should be paragraph 5 related to legal privilege, as stated in the report of the Executive Director, Place and this will be rectified on the website.

5.10 Public Question in respect of Tackling Poverty Strategy

Mick Watts referred to the Tackling Poverty Strategy on the agenda for the meeting. He asked how the proposal for Sheffield Money, a proposal to lend money at an interest rate of 0.4% a day, accorded with the Strategy?

Councillor Julie Dore commented that she understood Mr Watts' concerns. However Sheffield Money was not simply about lending money and had other elements to it.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health, added that the proposal to establish Sheffield Money was one of the recommendations of the Fairness Commission. A feasibility study had been carried out where it had been established that around 50,000 people in the City borrowed money by unconventional means and did not get a loan from the bank.

Sheffield Money were working with Sheffield Credit Union to lend money to individuals at a fair rate. In addition to that the Council was working with a company who provided loans at a much fairer rate than companies such as Wonga. The information about the feasibility study as well as case studies was available on the Council's website.

Councillor Iqbal further commented that the Council was working with the Citizens Advice Bureau to provide a triage service to try and assist people with all their financial matters.

Councillor Dore commented that if Mr Watts had any ideas of ways to tackle poverty these would be welcomed by the Council.

5.11 Petition in respect of Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools

Suzanne Wilde submitted a petition, containing 445 signatures, requesting that the City Council stop squeezing extra classes of pupils into the already overcrowded Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools. She commented that Dobcroft was the wrong choice for expansion and would not solve the primary school places crisis in Sheffield.

In 2015 there was no demand for additional school places at Dobcroft. Ecclesall School was most in need of expansion as this was central to the area of demand. Already at Dobcroft seven temporary classrooms existed which did not meet building standards. The additional places could not be provided without having to knock down nearby houses.

The School Hall at Dobcroft was already too small at the present time and the school playgrounds would have to be shrunk to accommodate the new classrooms. Ms. Wilde and others' concerns were also shared by the Governors of both the infant and junior schools who had rejected the Council proposals.

5.12 Public Question in respect of Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools

Sarah Jones asked why were parents at Dobcroft given pure catchment figures during the consultation period for the Dobcroft expansion, when the School Reorganisation Team stated they were not a way of assessing demand?

5.13 Public Question in respect of Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools

Nadine Cain asked, given the likelihood that the extra 30 places will be filled by non-catchment children, what will be the impact on Holt House and Nether Edge School?

5.14 Public Questions in respect of Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools

Richard Coldwell submitted a number of questions on behalf of the Governors of Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools in relation to proposals in respect of those Schools as follows:-

- (1) The initial consultation suffered from people misinterpreting data, people not having access to criteria-based evidence on why Dobcroft was the preferred option, Sheffield City Council only consulting on one option, and no one coming to engage parents with the debate. All of these risks were highlighted before consultation, by Dobcroft Governors at a meeting with the School Organisation Team on 6 January 2015. Would the School Organisation Team therefore commit to a lessons learned meeting with Governors, that will be reported back to Cabinet, prior to any further consultation?
- (2) Following National Offer Day on April 16 will Sheffield City Council make available:
 - (a) The number of first choice applications to primary schools in South West Sheffield by catchment area;
 - (b) The numbers from each catchment area who were offered to start in Dobcroft Infants in 2015, and how many from each catchment applied as their first, second or third choice; and
 - (c) The number of within catchment applications to South West Sheffield Primary Schools which, as of the date, of the release were unsuccessful.
- (3) Will the School Re-organisation team commit to coming back to Dobcroft Governors well in advance of any future consultation?
- (4) The expenditure of £14k on exploring Dobcroft proposals, and £10k on all other options within the paper has been interpreted by some to suggest far more effort is going into looking at Dobcroft than the other options which appear to solve greater amounts of catchment pressure in the area. Please could the basis for those cost estimates be provided to reassure people that that is not the case, along with clarity of what new intelligence it will buy in order to support any future consultation?
- (5) Many hours of Head Teacher, senior leadership, governing body and parent time have been invested so far in a consultation that has, in our opinion, not moved South West Sheffield forward in any way. What estimate is made of the cost of Council resources to date in exploring this issue and managing the initial consultation?
- (6) Due to the 'as the crow flies' rules, any capacity at Dobcroft not filled by catchment children will be open to lots of children from non-oversubscribed areas (notably Holt House) as a higher priority than the most pressured catchments of Ecclesall and Totley. How, therefore, does the Council consider that increasing Dobcroft catchment is a sensible solution for parents in Ecclesall and Totley?

(7) Related to the previous question, how many parents from Ecclesall and Totley changed their 1st choice preference from either of those two schools to Dobcroft as a result of the 2015 temporary expansion? This should give us an indication about the desirability of a bigger Dobcroft being a satisfactory solution to the anxieties parents in those catchments currently face?

(8) Is the Council considering changes to catchment boundaries as part of a future solution?

(9) Will the Council reassure us that this 'pause' is not merely a result of indecision, with a possible result being the further 'temporary expansion' (without consultation) for Dobcroft Infant School in 2016?

5.15 Public Question in respect of Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools

Polly Morley asked how are the health and safety issues associated with thirty extra children being imposed on the School at short notice being addressed?

5.16 In response to the questions on Dobcroft Infant and Junior School, Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, thanked all the members of the public for attending the meeting and for theirs and others' efforts thus far. She reported that there had been two proposals. Firstly to permanently expand Dobcroft to create places for children in the South West of the City. The other proposal was to temporarily expand Dobcroft with one class of thirty pupils beginning in reception and going all the way through.

She further reported that the proposal to permanently expand Dobcroft School had been paused. During the consultation period many parents, governors and others had come forward with different proposals. The statutory consultation process was for four weeks, so in order to fully explore the other proposals put forward, there was a need to pause the process.

The options presented would be looked into and investigated fully involving all relevant stakeholders and a proposal would again be put forward which would go through the statutory consultation process. People would be kept informed throughout the process and would be invited into discussions about what that proposal might be.

To set the context, Councillor Drayton stated that there had been a 25% increase in the birth rate in the City with particular pressures in the North East and South West. Predicting the need for school places was not an exact science. The Council used figures such as birth rates and who lived within an area. If a new housing development was being built the impact on school places could be predicted. There were other factors where the Council couldn't predict the impact on school places. For example, families who previously sent their children to private school may decide that they want to send their child to a state school in the area in the future. Changes in the demographic of an area can also not be predicted.

Dobcroft had recently seen eight families within the catchment area refused a place and that had not been predicted. The Council knew there was a need for extra places in the South West area. It was not necessarily the case that those places needed to be at Dobcroft. However, the Council had looked closely at the situation and saw that Dobcroft was in the middle of the Dore, Totley and Ecclesall area. It was also often a second preference for parents. The Council had believed that the temporary expansion of one class would allow those who had indicated Dobcroft as their second preference to remain in the South West area.

Discussions had been held with the school as to whether the Infant School could be expanded. In the Primary Stage, the School and Headteacher believed that could be achieved with financial support from the Council. The Council wanted pupils in the City to achieve their full potential and had no wish to impact on the educational experience of pupils at Dobcroft. The temporary expansion was different to a permanent expansion and a legal process had to be followed. Discussions had been held with the School but there was a need to act swiftly to secure the places.

Councillor Drayton hoped that she had answered the questions about the consultation process. The data had not been misinterpreted and it was not an exact science. The Council always learnt from any consultation. This particular consultation will build on the connections made and talk to parents, teachers, governors and others affected.

After the 16th April, the Council would know what preferences parents had indicated for their child and the data and figures could be provided after that date. All schools involved in the South West area would be included in the future consultation.

In terms of expenditure, an amount had been put aside for future consultation to explore all options. More work would be done on the expenditure required for Dobcroft School. All the available options would be explored in depth and detailed reasons would be provided as to why each option was chosen or not chosen.

Councillor Drayton believed consultation was very important. Listening to the voice of parents, teachers, children and governors was crucial and Councillor Drayton apologised if people believed they had not been listened to. The pause showed that people's views had been listened to and was not about indecision.

There was a need for the temporary expansion, as the letters had been sent out asking parents to indicate their preference and there was a concern that some parents would only indicate one preference and they needed to be shown that Dobcroft had available places.

The City-Wide Learning Body had established a Task and Finish Group to look at admissions and catchment areas would be a part of that. Catchment areas always needed to be reviewed and this would be done as part of this process.

Councillor Drayton did not believe that there would be an impact on Holt House

and Nether Edge as there were more places available than people who wanted to go to the schools. Health and safety was always a consideration.

Both Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools had a headteacher and a senior management team and the education of the children was always a priority.

In response to further questions from the public, Councillor Drayton reported that Ecclesall Infants could be expanded, but not the Juniors as there was not enough space to fit in an additional classroom. It would also not be the best way to manage the situation to ask all schools in the area to take on additional places.

It had already been costed what funding would be needed for the expansion of Dobcroft. What wasn't known at this stage was the cost for the other options so the figure of 10k was an estimate. If more funding was needed the Council would have to provide more.

In conclusion, Councillor Drayton commented that the recommendation to pause was to look again at whether the Council had got the right option for children and families. That wasn't to say that the permanent expansion wouldn't ultimately be the recommended option, but the Council would look again at all options before making a decision.

5.17 Public Questions in respect of Cobnar Cottage

Dennis Brewin submitted a number of questions in relation to Cobnar Cottage at Graves Park as follows:-

1) Why is Sheffield City Council, as trustees of the Graves Park Charity, persisting with the sale of the Cobnar Cottage Site, despite the fact that the Charity Commission has now told them that they must have a scheme?

2) Do they have such a scheme, and if so, what are the details?

3) Are the Cabinet, as trustees of the Graves Park Charity, aware of previous rulings regarding land and buildings within Graves Park during the past 17 years, all of which were resolved by confirmation from the Charity Commission that the land and buildings had to remain as part of Graves Park and could not be sold?

4) Could the trustees explain when the cottage was vacated by the last tenant, why was it not immediately let to another tenant, thus generating income for the Graves Park Charity and conserving an asset?

5) Are the trustees aware that the only reason that the cottage is now in such a deplorably dilapidated state is because of a water leak, which has received no remedial work or repair, leaving the ground floor standing in water for years?

6) Why was the cottage not originally repaired using the Council's insurance contingency fund?

5.18 Public Questions in respect of Cobnar Cottage

Lawrence Wolstenholme submitted a number of questions in relation to Cobnar Cottage as follows:-

- 1) Are the trustees aware that the Friends of Graves Park's own commissioned surveys indicate that to repair the cottage would now cost in excess of £160,000 and it would be considerably cheaper to demolish and rebuild?
- 2) Are the trustees aware that the Friends of Graves Park had confirmed to their representatives that there would be no cost to the Graves Park Trust if the business plan for the Memorial Garden on the site were to be accepted?
- 3) Why do the trustees of the Graves Park Charity continue to look for ways to break the covenants instead of working to conserve J.G. Graves gift for the future generations of Sheffield?
- 4) How can the Trustees of Graves Park guarantee that there will be no further attempts to break the covenants on charitable land within Graves Park if they have already broken the covenants to sell Cobnar Cottage to sell its land?

5.19 Public Questions in respect of Cobnar Cottage

Barbara Greatorex submitted the following questions in relation to Cobnar Cottage:-

- 1) Why in paragraph 4.7 of the report on Cobnar Cottage does it say that, during discussions with Friends of Graves Park, the "only suggestion made was to demolish Cobnar Cottage and create a memorial garden"?

Are the trustees aware that the Friends' original suggestion was for the Council to rectify its own neglect by restoring the cottage and renting it to a tenant with duties in the park, or to a tenant?

Are they aware that alternative uses included renting to an artisan, with living accommodation and workshop?

Are the trustees aware that the idea of a memorial garden was only presented as a business plan when it was made clear, in discussions and in writing, that the Council had no intention of supporting the restoration of the cottage for rental purposes, thus preventing the Friends from making any viable application for funding?

- 2) Are the trustees aware of the value of Cobnar Cottage as an amenity of the Park, given its historical significance? Are they aware that this is the last remaining detached cottage/workshop (originally there were 6) adjacent to the old London turnpike road?

Are they also aware that the report erroneously states that the trustees of Graves Park will be left with "an increasing maintenance and rates liability" if Cobnar Cottage is not sold, and purports that this is a disbenefit of accepting the Friends

of Graves Park option? In fact, the Friends of Graves Park proposition has multiple benefits that should be referred to in the report and presented positively. Because it involves demolishing the cottage and creating a heritage/memorial garden, at no cost to the Graves Park Trust, it actually removes the requirement to pay any residential property rates. It will provide an ongoing garden maintenance contribution from the Friends of Graves Park, where the Graves Park Trust has carried out virtually no maintenance for several years.

- 5.20 In response to the questions regarding Cobnar Cottage, Councillor Isobel Bowler, Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure commented that the report on the agenda for the meeting concerning Cobnar Cottage recommended that an application be made to the Charity Commission for disposal and the sale could only proceed with their approval. If this was granted, the Council would proceed with the sale.

In response to Mr Brewin's third question regarding previous rulings, Councillor Bowler replied that legal advice from Council Officers indicated that previous rulings should not be considered as they were not relevant to the current proposal. The report made clear that Charity Commission approval was required.

Councillor Bowler stated that Cobnar Cottage was a small property on Cobnar Road and was originally used as a Staff Cottage and had never been part of the park or used by the public. When the parks department no longer had a use for it, it was rented out as a Council home with the rent being paid back to the Charitable Trust.

The Council had to provide the funding to maintain the park and the trustees had to take that into consideration. The last tenant at the cottage left in 2005. This was during the period of investment to bring housing up to the Decent Homes Standard. As with all 'sundry' properties an assessment was made as to the cost effectiveness of bringing the property up to standard. The cost outweighed the return to the Housing Revenue Account and Sheffield Homes recommended that the property be removed from Council Housing stock. Other sundry properties in a similar state were disposed of. In this case the property was not disposed of but could not be rented because of poor condition so was left empty and had been empty for 10 years.

The water leak referred to by Mr Brewin had been brought up in many meetings and, whilst Councillor Bowler acknowledged that everyone would have preferred it not to have happened, the charity does not have the capital to restore the cottage.

The Council did not have an insurance contingency fund and even if they did this particular building was not one of the Council's assets. The Council's Capital Resource Pool was very tight. The question was always asked what the benefit of any investment would be, as the Council would have to justify this to the public. The cottage had not been prioritised for investment by the Council over a number of years' regardless of which administration was in power.

In response to Mr Wolstenholme's question, Councillor Bowler stated that she was not aware of the £160,000 figure quoted, but regardless, the money was not

available for the £100,000 figure she had been quoted. She found it difficult to believe that the public would support the demolition of the cottage but even if there was support the cost of this made it prohibitive.

The Council were aware that the Friends of Graves Park had stated that there would be no initial maintenance cost for a memorial garden on the site of a demolished cottage. However, the trustees needed to consider the benefit for the park as a whole and consider the investment that could be made into the park against the creation of more green space which might well have a maintenance cost in future.

Councillor Bowler took her responsibility as a trustee seriously and believed the park should be preserved for future generations. The cottage was on a small plot outside the park wall not currently used as part of the park and was not publically accessible.

Paragraph 4.3 of the report referred to the legal aspects. The Council were not looking to break the covenant and were seeking legal permission to dispose of this unused cottage and reinvest the receipt in the park.

A number of meetings had been held with the Friends of Graves Park to discuss what to do with the cottage. The Council would have been more than happy if the Friends had been able to present an alternative to disposal which had equal benefit to the park, which was why there had been a pause of the original decision for twelve months to see if the Friends were able to develop a funded proposal.

After the twelve month pause the Friends had reported back to the Council that they had been unable to find a funder to fund the rebuilding project. Therefore the decision for the trustees is to balance the benefit to the charity of demolishing the cottage and creating the memorial garden against disposal and receipt of a Capital sum to reinvest in the park. There were many improvements which could be made to the park.

Councillor Bowler and other Members of the Cabinet were aware of the historical significance of the cottage and would not wish to knock it down although they appreciated the Friends wish to keep the footings. The Council's proposal did not recommend demolition.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 It was reported that a Leader's decision in respect of the Tender for Re-provision of Day Services and Residential Short-Term Care Beds for People with Dementia had been considered by the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee at its meeting held on 25 February 2015 and it was resolved to take no action.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

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>		
Kathryn Brailsford	Senior Learning Manager, Watercliffe Meadow Primary School	23
Pamela Crowson	Admin Finance Officer, Nether Green Infant School	22
Janet Hattersley	Cleaner in Charge, Stocksbridge High School	26
Linda Oxley	Supervisory Assistant, Talbot Specialist School	20
Christine Ball	Senior Business Support Officer	33
Jean Whitney	Business Manager, Adoption and Fostering Service	45

Communities

Jane Wadsworth	Occupational Therapy Assistant	29
----------------	--------------------------------	----

(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. PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES IN SOUTH WEST SHEFFIELD

- 8.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report outlining the issue and detailing the response to the consultation on a proposal to increase pupil places at Dobcroft Infant and Junior Schools which finished on 11 February 2015.
- 8.2 Councillor Julie Dore reported that all Cabinet Members had received a copy of the consultation feedback and the questions submitted.
- 8.3 **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 others suggested in the consultation process, and that, 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.

8.4 Reasons for Decision

- 8.4.1 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.
- 8.4.2 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.

8.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 8.5.1 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.

9. THE GRAVES PARK CHARITABLE TRUST: COBNAR COTTAGE

- 9.1 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.

9.2 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 17 July 2013.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 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.

9.3.2 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.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

9.4.1 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 the 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.

10. CARE HOME MARKET AND FEES ANALYSIS 2015/16

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

10.2 Joe Fowler, Director of Commissioning, referred Members to the table at paragraph 4.93 of the report. Officers believed that the figures provided by Birmingham and Manchester for their nursing care did not include the Funded Nursing Care figures. This would add £110 to the figures stated – making the

figures much more realistic. This correction only reaffirmed that the price paid in Sheffield for residential and nursing care was relatively low in comparison to other cities and our near neighbours. The table at paragraph 4.91 gave comparative figures for South Yorkshire, which were more directly comparable and more relevant due to the shared labour market.

10.3 **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.

10.4 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.4.1 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.
- 10.4.2 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.
- 10.4.3 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.
- 10.4.4 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.
- 10.4.5 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.
- 10.4.6 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.
- 10.4.7 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%.

10.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.5.1 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

10.5.2 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.

10.5.3 Each option was risk assessed as summarised below. Detailed risk assessments are included in the report 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 the 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

11. **DEFERRED PAYMENT SCHEME (THE CARE ACT)**

11.1 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.

11.2 **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.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

- 11.3.1 Meets the requirements of the Care Act 2014.
- 11.3.2 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.
- 11.3.3 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.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 11.4.1 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.

- 11.4.2 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.

12. CORPORATE PLAN 2015-18

12.1 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.

12.2 **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; and
- (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.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 To approve the Corporate Plan for 2015-18.

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 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.

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

13.1 The Interim Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the Month 9 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme as at 31st December 2014.

13.2 **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; and

(ii) approves the proposed variations and slippage in Appendix 4.1 of the report;

(d) notes the latest position on the Capital Programme; and

(e) notes the slippage requests authorised by the Cabinet Member for Finance under his delegated authority.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

13.3.1 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.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

13.4.1 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 the Capital Programme.

14. **HOUSING EMPLOYABILITY AND APPRENTICE SCHEME**

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

14.2 **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 and Neighbourhood Services 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.

14.3 **Reasons for Decision**

14.3.1 The changes described in the report will deliver many of the Council's and

Housing Service's commitment, visions and strategic objectives.

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

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

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

14.4.1 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.

14.4.2 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.

14.4.3 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.

15. **FUTURESHAPERS - A YOUTH ENGAGEMENT FUND PROJECT**

15.1 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

15.2 **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 Interim 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 Families, in consultation with the Interim Executive Director, Resources and the Director of Legal and Governance, to take all such necessary steps to ensure that the Council'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 Families to recommend, in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, a suitable candidate to assist the Board of Futureshapers properly to manage public funds and services.

15.3 Reasons for Decision

- 15.3.1 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.
- 15.3.2 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 Council's investment, 100% of the return will be achieved in delivery and overall outcomes payments. This represents a high value use of Council investment.
- 15.3.3 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.
- 15.3.4 Futureshapers allows Sheffield City Council (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.

15.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 15.4.1 Sheffield City Council (SCC) is not eligible to submit a bid to the Youth Engagement Fund (YEF), which is primarily aimed at charitable and private organisations acting as the contractor and delivery agent.
- 15.4.2 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.

- 15.4.3 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.
- 15.4.4 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.

16. TACKLING POVERTY STRATEGY

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

16.2 **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 refers 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.

16.3 Reasons for Decision

- 16.3.1 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.

- 16.3.2 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).

16.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 16.4.1 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.

17. **FUTURE OPTIONS FOR THE HOUSING REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE**

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

17.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposal in the report 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, such steps to 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.

17.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 17.3.1 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.

- 17.3.2 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.
- 17.3.3 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.
- 17.3.4 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.
- 17.3.5 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.
- 17.3.6 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.
- 17.3.7 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.

- 17.3.8 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.
- 17.3.9 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.
- 17.3.10 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
- 17.3.11 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.

17.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

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

- 18.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval in principle for the proposed University of Sheffield Campus Phase 1 project.
- 18.2 Matt Hayman, Development Officer, reported that, following further advice from the Finance Service, paragraph 9.3 of the report should be updated to read ‘The project does carry some risk for the Council because it will involve the Council recovering the cost from the University. This will require a very clear

understanding from both parties on the extent and specification of the works. Any variations from this base will need to be documented and agreed in advance if the Council is to avoid a loss. The cost plan will be the key driver to ensure works can be delivered within the available resources and the costs will be capped at the budgeted amounts. Disciplined project management is essential to ensure successful mitigation of the risk.'

18.2 **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 (a) (i) 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 Sheffield City Region Investment Fund (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.

18.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 18.3.1 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.
- 18.3.2 To enable the Council to secure funding for the project from SCRIF.
- 18.3.3 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.

18.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 18.4.1 **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.
- 18.4.2 **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 Council's 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 Council's influence on consistency of the overall programme weakened.
- 18.4.3 **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.

- 18.4.4 **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.