

Cabinet

Meeting held 19 February 2020

**PRESENT:** Councillors Terry Fox (Deputy Chair), Jackie Drayton, Mazher Iqbal, Bob Johnson, Mark Jones, Mary Lea, George Lindars-Hammond, Abtissam Mohamed and Paul Wood

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 An apology for absence was received from the Chair (Councillor Julie Dore).

**2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

2.1 The Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) reported that appendix 2 to the report at agenda item 15 (see minute numbered 14 below) – ‘Appropriation of the Former Hemsworth Primary School Site’ - was not available to the public and press because it contained exempt information described in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person. Accordingly, if the content of the appendix was to be discussed, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 Councillor Jackie Drayton declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in agenda item 9 (see minute numbered 8 below) – ‘People Keeping Well – Next Steps’ – on the grounds that her spouse was an employee of SOAR. Councillor Drayton left the room for the duration of that item of business and did not take part in the discussion or vote thereon.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020, were approved as a correct record.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 The Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) invited members of the public to ask the questions which they had submitted prior to the start of the meeting.

5.2 Public Question Regarding Governance – The Quality Monitoring of the Streets Ahead Contract

5.2.1 Russell Johnson stated that, at the Council meeting two weeks ago, he posed a perfectly serious question regarding the continuing poor state of many of Sheffield's roads, despite almost 8 years of huge sums of public money being poured into Amey. He had referred the Leader of the Council to an article published in December in the Sheffield Star newspaper, and which he hoped the Leader had had time to read.

5.2.2 Mr. Johnson added that, sadly, the Leader, rather than make any attempt to provide a meaningful answer, had merely resorted to a flimsy anecdote about her own personal driving experience.

5.2.3 Mr. Johnson stated that he now sought a serious response: is the lack of proper supervision and challenge to Amey by Officers under the Council's direction the cause of continued failed delivery on contract requirements? Why has Sheffield not acted responsibly in this respect and disentangled itself from this disastrous PFI, as Birmingham has done? Does the Deputy Leader understand why some people have discerned the stench of corruption around this apparent paradox?

5.3 Public Question Regarding the Tree Felling Injunction & Unjust Costs

5.3.1 Russell Johnson stated that since the basis of the Injunction is now seriously questioned because the veracity of some of the evidence presented by Sheffield City Council representatives in the High Court has been questioned, partly due to Freedom Of Information requests, of which more are in the pipeline, SCC Officers have recently again persisted in seeking to collect extortionate costs from two citizens, for breaching of this unsound, in his view, Injunction. He added that one of those people is appearing in court next week, under constant threat. He asked that, in view of the climate of co-operation now achieved around the tree destruction scandal, would it not be appropriate, as an act of generosity by the Council and in the climate of rapprochement, for the Council to use its discretion to waive those costs?.

5.4 Public Question Regarding Corporate Hospitality

5.4.1 Russell Johnson commented that a 'Rotten Boroughs' feature in a London magazine recently highlighted the Leader of the Council's eleven acceptances of Sheffield Wednesday Football Club's hospitality. In the same period, only two similar visits to Sheffield United Football Club were declared. Mr. Johnson asked what 'Business Interests' are being promoted, and why the apparent partiality in this matter?

5.5 Public Questions Regarding the Leader's Awareness of Freedom of Information Releases, and the Process for Asking Public Questions

5.5.1 Chris Parkinson stated that, at the last Council meeting, he attempted to ask a genuine question that was based on facts readily available in the public domain, but unfortunately he was shouted down by the Leader of the Council. This

interruption was made before he had even begun to raise the substance of the question and it had surprised him that a person in such a powerful position was prepared and happy to shout down a member of the public despite them being hardly aware of the contents of the question. This had led to Mr. Parkinson taking time to think about the pervasive aggression among councillors towards the public and the apparent contempt with which the public is treated, and he added that he would like, later, to suggest some ways of changing this. He stated that he would like to hear answers to his question and to know more about the way councillors are kept informed of developing issues.

5.5.2 Mr. Parkinson commented that, in direct connection to his question asked at full Council, could he ask the Leader “when data, emails, correspondence etc is released through the Freedom Of Information process, to what extent is the Cabinet and the Leader briefed? Is it an overview of all FOIs or is it only on some FOIs which might be considered especially sensitive, such as the large number of releases made recently regarding the, arguably illegal and scandalous, programme of tree felling in Sheffield?”

5.5.3 Mr. Parkinson also asked has the Leader, or Cabinet, now caught up with the FOI he made reference to in full Council on 4<sup>th</sup> February, and does she accept that his question was based in fact and on information in the public domain. If so, would it be reasonable to expect an apology for her less than professional behaviour at full Council, as one would be graciously received. It would also, he felt, serve to placate wider Cabinet-public relations.

5.5.4 Lastly, Mr. Parkinson wished to relay to the Cabinet how frustrating it is for members of the public to ask questions at the full Council meeting. The scene before the start of Council and the process for question submission is often one of chaos and disorganisation. Paper forms are rarely available, there are few places to write questions down, and it is difficult to identify to whom to submit questions. There is a lack of guidance generally. He suggested that, if one were to be anxious or conspiratorial, one might be forgiven for thinking it is a deliberate attempt to obstruct the public asking questions and scrutinising the Cabinet, something reinforced by the general attitude observed within the Chamber where Councillors are jeering, which he felt was a disgrace. Mr. Parkinson concluded by stating that, conscious of not wanting to waste tax payers money, he wished to submit a suggestion sheet of how this process might be improved so as to avoid unnecessary planning and review committees to discuss this matter further. He passed his suggestion sheet to the Deputy Chair, and outlined some of the practical suggestions he had made.

## 5.6 Public Questions from Mr. Buxton

5.6.1 Mr. Buxton stated that he wished for answers to be provided to the questions asked by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Parkinson, prior to him asking his own questions.

5.6.2 The Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) twice asked Mr. Buxton to ask his questions, and Mr. Buxton declined to do so until the previous questions had been answered.

At this point in the proceedings (at approximately 2.20 p.m.), in view of the disruption caused to the proceedings of the meeting, the Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) adjourned the meeting. The meeting re-convened at approximately 2.35 p.m., with the meeting closed to the public for the remainder of the proceedings.)

- 5.7 The Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) asked that arrangements be made for written answers to be provided to the questions which had been submitted by members of the public.

## **6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

### **6.1 Call-in of Decisions**

- 6.1.1 It was noted that there had been no items called-in for scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

### **6.2 Scrutiny of the 2020/21 Revenue Budget and Capital Programme Report**

- 6.2.1 A report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee was circulated at the meeting, outlining the outcome of the Committee's consideration, at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2020, of the 2020/21 Revenue Budget and Capital Programme report, which was to be considered at today's Cabinet meeting.
- 6.2.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet notes the recommendation made by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee that Cabinet approves the recommendations in the report on the 2020/21 Revenue Budget and Capital Programme without amendment.

## **7. SHEFFIELD INCLUSION STRATEGY 2020-2025**

- 7.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report seeking approval to the Sheffield Inclusion Strategy 2020-2025, which was appended to the report.

The report indicated that, following the local area Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) inspection in November 2018, the Council has worked with partners, including Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Sheffield Parent Carer Forum, to co-produce a clear vision and strategy for inclusion, including Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

- 7.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet approves the Inclusion Strategy so that an associated action plan, building on and incorporating the Written Statement of Action, can begin to be written.

**7.3 Reasons for Decision**

Sheffield requires a clear strategic plan for improvement in regards to inclusion. The strategy has been co-produced to do so.

**7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

Not applicable – the Council is duty bound to co-produce an Inclusion Strategy as part of its Written Statement of Action for Ofsted.

**8. PEOPLE KEEPING WELL - NEXT STEPS (2020-2023)**

8.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report outlining the plans for the next three years (April 2020 to March 2023) for the People Keeping Well (PKW) Programme.

The PKW Programme is part of the Better Care Fund and is Sheffield's community based approach to improving people's health and wellbeing (sometimes described as social prescribing) and is delivered by voluntary, community and faith organisations.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) notes and acknowledge the contents of the report;

(b) authorises grant funding of the lead partners, as detailed and set out in the report, in order to deliver the People Keeping Well Programme (April 2020 to March 2023); and

(c) where no authority exists under the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, delegates such authority to the Director of Commissioning, Inclusion and Learning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care and the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to award grant funding and thereafter to enter into funding agreements in line with the report and to take such other steps where no authority exists, to meet the aims and objectives of the report, for the period April 2020 to March 2023.

**8.3 Reasons for Decision**

The reasons for the recommendations made are detailed in the table in section 6 of the report.

**8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

Section 5 of the report details the pros and cons of the alternative options which were considered and discounted. Those alternative options were (a) refresh and review the current PKW Leads, (b) decommission and deliver in-house and (c) decommission and end PKW.

(Note: Having earlier declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item of business, Councillor Jackie Drayton left the meeting room for the duration of the item.)

## **9. DISCRETIONARY SUPPORT FOR INWARD INVESTMENT**

9.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report seeking support for the provision of financial encouragement for inward investment into Sheffield in return for social and economic benefits and, specifically, seeking approval to (a) a delegated arrangement to provide support for inward investment developments where such support demonstrates value for money and brings tangible benefits to the City and (b) the provision of a grant of £500,000 to secure an inward investment in to the Lower Don Valley that will generate over 1,500 jobs, and up to a £309,500 contribution towards a grant that will create 90 jobs at Parkwood Springs.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) endorses, in principle, the approach to encourage inward investment where such an investment can demonstrate value for money and social and economic benefits for the City;

(b) to the extent not covered by existing delegations, delegates authority to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance, and the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, to make specific decisions on providing support for inward investment proposals that meet the following conditions:-

- The proposed financial support is for genuine inward investment activity that will be new to the City.
- A value for money assessment, including the social and economic benefits, is included as part of the consultation with the nominated Cabinet Members;

(c) approves a £500,000 inward investment grant to Clipper Logistics Plc in respect to their investment at Shepcote Lane; and

(d) approves a contribution of up to £309,500 to Skyline Luge Sheffield in respect to a grant of £619,000 being provided by the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority (SCRCA) for their investment at Parkwood Springs.

### **9.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 Inward Investment has the opportunity to bring significant social and economic benefits to the City. In order to help attract and secure inward investment the Council has the ability to provide grant funding either through a direct grant to the investor or through a contribution to a grant provided by the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Business Investment Fund where that is required. The benefits of supporting inward investment in this manner can include job creation, improved wages, bespoke travel arrangements, training programmes and the development of local supply chains with existing local businesses.
- 9.3.2 In order to ensure the Council has the ability to act quickly and in confidence with potential inward investors, it is proposed that delegated arrangements are established to enable grants to be provided where a value for money case can justify the investment.
- 9.3.3 In order to secure a £20m investment at Shepcote Lane that has now created over 1,500 jobs, approval from the Council is sought to confirm the provision of £500,000 to the investor. In addition, up to £309,500 is required to support a £619,000 grant from the SCRCA towards an investment at Parkwood Springs that has the potential to create 90 jobs and create a new major leisure attraction in the City.

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

- 9.4.1 Being able to respond quickly, efficiently and with confidence to an inward investment enquiry is considered important to securing the investment together with the social and economic benefits that would result. Retaining existing approval arrangements is an option, however it is considered that the delegated arrangements outlined in the report would provide certainty to negotiations with inward investors which in turn would increase the likelihood of securing such an investment in Sheffield.
- 9.4.2 No threshold for the size of grant to be agreed under the delegation has been identified. It is considered that an assessment of affordability alongside the economic and social benefits resulting from the investment will form part of the assessment process prior to consideration by the Members and Officer with delegated authority.
- 9.4.3 With regard to the Skyline Luge grant, the SCR funding will not be provided without the contribution from SCC. The overall grant will look to secure the Skyline investment in Sheffield rather than a number of other sites they are considering in

the UK and across Europe.

- 9.4.4 In respect to the Clipper grant, the risk of not providing the grant would be significant reputational damage having indicated the funding would be forthcoming. The occupier, Pretty Little Thing, has delivered against the expectations associated with the grant offer and delivered significant benefits to the local community.

## **10. PROPOSAL FOR ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS FOR SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

- 10.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report presenting proposals for a committee system and for an enhanced leader and cabinet model of governance, as recommended by Full Council at its meeting on 5 February 2020, for consideration by Cabinet.

In May 2020, a referendum will be held to determine whether the Council retains its leader and cabinet model of decision making, or moves to a committee system model. The Council is required to draw up and publish proposals for a committee system before holding the referendum.

- 10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) as recommended by Full Council at its meeting on 5 February 2020, approves:-

(i) the proposals for an enhanced Leader and Cabinet governance model; and

(ii) proposals for a Committee system of governance to be published before a referendum, as set out in the report; and

(b) requests the Director of Policy, Performance and Communications, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance, to publish a notice as required by the Referendum Regulations, setting out the main features of these proposals, and to undertake additional activity to ensure that they are communicated to people in the city as clearly as possible before the referendum, including showing the indicative costs of both systems.

- 10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The Council must produce and publish a proposal for a committee system, as required by the 2011 and 2012 regulations. The proposals for a committee system meet the principles endorsed by Full Council in January 2020 and were recommended to Cabinet by Full Council in February 2020.

10.3.2 The proposals for an enhanced Leader and Cabinet model reflect the same principles and were also recommended to Cabinet by Full Council.

10.3.3 The Council will also take into account the governance principles and ways of working in the further development of proposals for either model of governance and following the referendum in May 2020 (as outlined in the further work at Section 9) to enable it to meet its ambitions set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report.

#### 10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 The Council must produce a proposal for a committee system before a referendum under the 2011 regulations. There is some scope to look at different designs of committee system. In looking at the outline design of the proposals, the work done by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee (OSMC) has been taken into account, including the evidence considered by the Committee relating to approaches taken at different local authorities.

10.4.2 Alternative governance models in operation at other local authorities were looked at by the OSMC during the scrutiny exercise concerning governance. These included strengthened arrangements for pre-decision scrutiny in a Leader and Cabinet model of governance, such as in Rotherham Council and the development of proposals for a committee system underway at Cheshire East Council.

10.4.3 The Council does not have to consider proposals for an enhanced leader/cabinet model as part of the requirements before a referendum. However, we believe it is very important, following the review by the Scrutiny Committee, to reflect on how the existing arrangements work and say how the existing arrangements might be enhanced to help meet the governance principles adopted by Full Council in January 2020.

### 11. **REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2020/21**

11.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report containing proposals with regard to the Council's Revenue Budget for 2020-21 and the Capital Strategy 2020-2025.

The purpose of the Revenue Budget report is to:-

- approve the City Council's revenue budget for 2020/21, including the position on reserves and balances;
- approve a 2020/21 Council Tax for the City Council; and
- note the levies and precepts made on the City Council by other authorities.

The purpose of the Capital Programme Report is to:-

- set out the Council's key priority areas for capital investment;
- provide an overview of specific projects included in the years 2020 to 2025;
- set out the overall shape of the current Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2025 (at Appendix 2);
- set out the Council's principles for how it invests in non-cash assets; and
- provide background to the Council's Corporate Investment Fund Policy (at Appendix 1).

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020:-

(a) to approve a net Revenue Budget for 2020/21 amounting to £420.171m;

(b) to approve a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,621.40 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept);

(c) to approve the proposed amendments to the Long Term Empty premium which applies to Council Tax charges in respect of Long Term Empty Dwellings, as set out in paragraph 48 of the Revenue Budget report, with effect from 1 April 2020;

(d) to note that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003; and that further details can be found in Appendix 4 and within the Section 25 Statutory Statement on Sustainability of Budget and Level of Reserves from paragraph 15 of the Revenue Budget report;

(e) to approve the savings as set out in Appendix 2 of the Revenue Budget report;

(f) to approve the revenue budget allocations for each of the services, as set out in Appendices 3a to 3d of the Revenue Budget report;

(g) to note that, based on the estimated expenditure level set out in Appendix 3 to the Revenue Budget report, the amounts shown in part B of Appendix 6 of the report would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2020/21, in accordance with sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

(h) to note the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner and of South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;

(i) to approve the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of Council Tax income in 2020/21 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 85 of the Revenue Budget report;

(j) to approve the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;

(k) to approve the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report; which takes into account the revisions proposed for 2019/20 onwards;

(l) to agree that authority be delegated to the Executive Director, Resources, to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;

(m) to approve a Pay Policy for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;

(n) to agree that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2017/18 and onwards, approved on 3 March 2017, and implemented for 2018/19 and 2019/20, be also implemented for 2020/21;

(o) to approve the contents of the Capital Strategy & Budget Book and the specific projects included in the years 2020/21 to 2024/25; that block allocations are included within the programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures; and

(p) to approve the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2024/25, as per appendix 2 of the Capital report.

### **11.3 Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 The City Council on 4 March 2020 meets to consider the Revenue Budget for 2020/21 and to determine the Council Tax for that year. The report provides information to enable the Council to set a budget and determine the Council Tax. The proposals set out in this report provide for a balanced budget to be recommended to Council.

11.3.2 The proposed projects within the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.

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

- 11.4.1 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.

(Note: 1. This is a matter reserved for approval at Full Council at its meeting to be held on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2020, and is not, therefore, subject to call-in; and

2. During the consideration of the above item of business, the Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) left the meeting, and Councillor Jackie Drayton took the Chair during his absence.)

#### 12. **REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2019/20 - AS AT 31/12/2019**

- 12.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing the outturn monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget 2019/20, as at the end of Month 9 (31<sup>st</sup> December 2019).

#### 12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report and the attached appendices on the 2019/20 Revenue Budget Outturn; and

(b) in relation to the Capital Programme, notes the forecast Outturn position described in Appendix 2 of the report.

#### 12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

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

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

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

(At this point in the proceedings, the Deputy Chair (Councillor Terry Fox) re-entered the meeting and took the Chair for the remainder of the proceedings.)

### **13. MONTH 9 CAPITAL APPROVALS**

13.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme 2019/20, as brought forward in Month 9.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contract; and

(b) approves the making of grants to third parties, as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.

### **13.3 Reasons for Decision**

13.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.

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

13.3.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

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

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

**14. APPROPRIATION OF THE FORMER HEMSWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL SITE (BLACKSTOCK ROAD) FOR HOUSING PURPOSES\***

14.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report seeking approval for the former Hemsworth Primary School site (Blackstock Road, Gleadless Valley, S14 1AA) to be appropriated for the purposes of Part II of the Housing Act 1985 to be used for the provision of extra care housing or other older person housing (such as Older Persons Independent Living), and to request that previous decisions by Cabinet regarding the use and disposal of the site be rescinded.

14.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

(a) the Cabinet decisions of September 2002 and June 2007, in respect of the disposal of the former Hemsworth Primary School site for extra care housing and that the disposal be to the Extra Care Charitable Trust, be rescinded; and

(b) subject to no objections to the open space notice being received, the former Hemsworth Primary School site be appropriated for the purposes of Part II of the Housing Act 1985 for the provision of extra care housing or other older person housing through the Housing Revenue Account Stock Increase Programme.

**14.3 Reasons for Decision**

The former Hemsworth Primary School site has remained vacant since 2005 and was recently declared surplus to the requirements of the 'People' portfolio. Appropriating the site for the purposes of Part II of the Housing Act 1985 will enable the Council to fulfill its longstanding intention to develop older persons housing on the site as part of the Council's Stock Increase Programme.

**14.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

Three alternatives have been considered:-

(1) **'Do nothing'**. As the site has been left vacant since at least 2005 and is currently a maintenance liability for the Council, 'doing nothing' is not considered to be a suitable option.

(2) **Develop the site for older persons' accommodation via market disposal** which might attract Registered Providers and/or institutional investors (based on soft market testing).

(3) **Develop the site with non-age-specific general needs housing via market disposal.**

In relation to alternative options (2) and (3) - as the Council is now delivering older persons' developments elsewhere in the city, it is able to make best use of that

understanding and expertise to deliver the site for the provision of extra care housing or other older person housing through the Council Housing Stock Increase Programme. If the site remains in Council ownership, the Council will be able to retain greater control over the type of development that best meets the needs of older people in the city. Keeping the asset in Council ownership will deliver a rental income to the Housing Revenue Account over the lifetime of the development.

This page is intentionally left blank