

Co-operative Executive

Meeting held 19 January 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Terry Fox (Chair), Julie Grocutt (Deputy Chair), Jayne Dunn, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Douglas Johnson, Paul Turpin and Alison Teal

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mazher Iqbal and Paul Wood. Apologies were also received from Kate Josephs and Gillian Duckworth.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 It was reported that the appendix to the following report was not available to the public and press because it contained exempt information described in Paragraphs 2 and 6 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:-

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Excluded Appendix</u>
16	Gleadless Valley Masterplan	Appendix 1

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Douglas Johnson declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 10 – Parkwood Options Appraisal as a Member of Friends of Parkwood.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of meetings of the Co-Operative Executive held on 17th November 2021 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 The Co-Operative Executive received an electronic petition containing 228 signatures opposing the Clean Air Zone Charging. There was no speaker to the petition.

Councillor Douglas Johnson responded and explained that the Clean Air Zone sought to reduce air pollution across the city to improve the health of everybody who lived and worked in Sheffield. Councillor Johnson stated that air pollution

contributed to approximately 500 early deaths in Sheffield per year. He said that action had to be taken and added that there was a legal duty to address this issue. Councillor Johnson stated that the Clean Air Zone did not intend to charge cars.

- 5.2 The Co-Operative Executive received an electronic petition containing 33 signatures opposing the plans to impose red lines on Ecclesall Road. There was no speaker to this petition.

Councillor Johnson stated that an extensive consultation had taken place on this issue. He said that many responses had been gathered through this process. He stated that the aim of the proposals was to improve bus networks in Sheffield. He added that the consultation remained open, and feedback was welcome through this process.

- 5.3 The Co-Operative Executive received a petition containing 63 signatures requesting the review and removal of the double yellow lines at the junction of Gainsford Road and Staniforth Road. There was no speaker to this petition.

Councillor Johnson stated that the lines on this junction were introduced in 1981. He said he had more information on this area which he would share with the petitioner. He added that Officers were willing to look at this issue further in a resource appropriate manner.

- 5.4 Abby Hodggets read out the following Public Question from Neil Schofield:

'I am asking this Question as Joint Chair of the Friends of Parkwood Springs, which is a large and active community group. We work in close partnership with the City Council to improve the whole of Parkwood Springs, as a resource for people, wildlife and the natural environment.

Later in this meeting the Co-operative Executive will consider at Item 10 a report entitled 'Parkwood Options Appraisal'.

Initially the Friends Group had considerable concerns about parts of the proposal. However, since Christmas we have been able to have very helpful discussions with Officers and the Cabinet Member. We remain absolutely opposed to an aspect of one of the options - that access by vehicles to the potential Skyline site might be from Cooks Wood Road/Shirecliffe Road. However we now understand why the Council needs to include that option in the process.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that in line with Department of Transport guidance, the transport options study will include early identification of the environmental and community constraints and impacts of each option alongside technical appraisals? We believe this is essential to ensure that fully informed decisions can be taken.

Can he also re-affirm that the Friends Group and any other appropriate community groups will be fully involved at every stage of the process from here on for the development of the potential Skyline site at Parkwood Springs, to ensure

that their views and concerns are given full weight in the process?’

Councillor Terry Fox responded to this question on behalf of Councillor Mazher Iqbal, who was not in attendance. Councillor Fox stated that the Council valued their friend groups and all community organisations. He said that access options had to be included in the Parkwood Appraisals document as part of the assessment process. He added that the Council would continue to work with the friends’ groups, and he stated that had they fallen short on part of the consultation process he apologised. He said that there was a full agenda item on Parkwood Springs.

5.5 Abby Hodggets read out the following Public Question from Geoff Cox:

‘In May 2021 the Cooperative Executive was formed around six commitments, one of which was to implement the recommendations in Arup’s ‘Pathways to Zero Carbon in Sheffield’ report.

Is this Council still committed to implementing these recommendations by 2030? Has the investment funding necessary to implement these recommendations been secured? If not, please explain what steps are being taken to secure that funding and to what timescale?’

Councillor Johnson stated that the Council still had a commitment to implement the measures referred too, and he added that the Council was still on target to meet net zero by 2030. Councillor Johnson said that the required funding was not currently available. He said that the approach to addressing these issues was included in the 10 Point Plan, which would come to the Co-Operative Executive in due course.

5.6 Abby Hodgetts read out the following Public Questions from Nigel Slack:

Question One: ‘My apologies for the repetitive nature of this first question but since I am yet to receive a reasonable response I feel it necessary to continue asking, even in the face of such obstinate ignorance.

Firstly, my thanks to the Deputy Leader for her response to question 2 from the set of specific questions first asked on 17th November 2021. Clearly the rules and expectations around ‘recorded voting’ within Council is worthy of further conversation.

The attached specific points, with respect to the new ‘plan’ for Property Services, were first put to Council in questions 1 & 3 of that same November date, 8 weeks ago, following on from an initial question on the issues in October 2021. I repeated the questions for the December Exec Meeting but Covid issues led to that meeting being cancelled, though the questions were forwarded to the Exec Member by Democratic Services. That question has not even received an acknowledgement, never mind any actual answers.

I therefore wish to give the Exec Member one last chance to respond in detail before escalating the matter. When might I expect a detailed response in writing?

Please remember Council has had 8 weeks to respond so far.'

Question Two: I share the Leader's disappointment in the news that has come out over last weekend about the behaviour of the Chief Executive. I understand his wanting to await the report of Sue Gray before looking into this further, but remain concerned over the independence of the Sue Gray enquiry and the likelihood that 'scapegoats' will be sacrificed to save 'Big Dog' himself.

Irrespective, how soon after that report is published, might we expect the Senior Officer Employment Committee to meet and discuss the issues surrounding this revelation?'

Councillor Cate McDonald responded to question one. She stated that a written response had been submitted to question one, and she apologised that the answer had not been shared. Councillor McDonald said she would share a detailed response with Mr Slack in writing.

Councillor Fox responded to question two. He stated that since he had been informed of the issues mentioned he had been taking advice and following due process. He said he had announced that a committee had been set up to look into the matter and to establish the facts. He added that the committee was due to begin work on the 20th January 2022, and that he expected the committee to move at pace. Councillor Fox said that the names of those on the committee would be shared shortly and he added that all powers would be handed over to that committee.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 It was noted that there had been no items called-in for scrutiny since the last meeting of the Co-Operative Executive.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

RESOLVED: That this Co-operative Executive:-

(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>Place</u>		
Tarn Alflat	Income Specialist	35
John Baldwin	Bereavement Officer	34

Mark Bayliss	Park Attendant and Gardener	44
David Clark	Senior Building Surveyor	40
Chris Gorner	Senior Building Services Engineer	43
Lorraine Greeves	Neighbourhood Manager	35
Andrea Howson	Administrative Officer, Building Control and Planning	43
Andrew Naylor	Service Manager Heating, Mechanical and Electrical	40
Ann Parkes	Passenger Assistant	36
Dennis Wyatt	Engineer	41

People Services

Melanie Ainsworth	Care Manager Level 3	38
Katarina Bajin-Stone	Senior Fieldwork Manager	37
Lynn Barlow	Library and Information Assistant	41
Karen Baugh	Care Manager Level 2	35
Allan Booth	Technical and Programme Works Team Leader	44
Caroline Chettleburgh	Head of Hearing Impaired and Vision Support Services	30
Patricia Clark	Library and Information Assistant	38
Lesley Fletcher	Support Worker, Assessor Team	20
Eileen Hallam	Support Worker, City Wide Care Alarms	43

Cath Thompson	Consultation Officer,	39
	Targeted Intervention and Learning	
Catherine Vickers	Portage Home Visitor	20

(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. AGREEMENT OF PROPOSED COVID MEMORIAL ACTIVITY IN SHEFFIELD

8.1 This report detailed proposed COVID Memorial activity in Sheffield during 2022 and sought agreement from Co-operative Executive for these proposals. Members were also invited to provide any further thoughts and guidance.

3 elements were proposed to the memorial. A memorial archive, a memorial trail and a centralised memorial. Funding was in place and public engagement would take place before final decisions were made.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Approves proposals for COVID memorial activity described in the report and confirm agreement to use some public health underspend towards the COVID Memorial Activity.
2. Delegates authority to the Executive Director for Place who in consultation with the Executive Director for Resources will be responsible for ensuring the delivery of the COVID Memorial Activity including the award of contracts following mini competition.
3. To the extent not already delegated to them by the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and Director of Finance and Commercial Services to prepare and execute all required documentation and take steps to implement these recommendations.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 There has been a degree of discussion over the last ten months regarding these proposals, including with elected members. However, by taking the decision to agree these proposals Co-operative Executive will help to firmly put these proposals in place as Sheffield's commitment to memorialising the pandemic

period, and the work on these proposals can then move forward in earnest. Outcomes from this decision include:

- Providing a start point for sharing the proposals with Sheffield citizens;
- Setting in motion a more concentrated round of involvement and consultation;
- Confirming the start of work on the Memorial Archive once mini-competition bids have been assessed;
- Enabling discussions with LAC Chairs and others to roll forward in respect of the Memorial trail;
- Enabling consultation around and the tendering process for a centralised memorial.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 The COVID Memorial Group mulled over a number of potential options for memorial activity, but the three strands as set out were established very early on. Once those principles were in place the group has considered and continues to consider some of the detail. However no significant alternative approaches have been suggested or considered.

8.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

8.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

8.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Resources

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

9. PARKWOOD OPTIONS APPRAISAL

9.1 This report sought to provide an update on the development of leisure use at Parkwood following the termination of the Agreement for Lease with Extreme

The Council has undertaken a project review and options appraisal for future development of the site to decide how best to proceed and this report seeks delegated authority to

1. progress the preferred option as set out in the report, and

2. identify and secure funding for upfront site assessment/investigation works and for the clearance of the site of debris and invasive vegetation, subject to

compliance with the Council's budget processes, financial regulations and Capital Approval processes

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Notes the progress made to date on delivery of development of the Parkwood site;
- 2) Endorses the strategy outlined in this report for the delivery of development at Parkwood;
- 3) Allocates £200,000 from established investment resources to develop the proposal and underwrite the cost of site clearance works and a detailed transport, and ecological assessment;
- 4) Recommends that a suitable communications and engagement strategy is developed to manage the ongoing development of the Parkwood site as proposals progress; and
- 5) Recommends that discussions are held with Mayoral Combined Authority to explore the potential for external funding to undertake the site assessment/investigation/access surveys, undertake the site clearance works and the longer term implementation of access and development works to bring the site forward.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 As outlined in the report, there is a still a very clear strategic and economic case to justify leisure development of the Parkwood site. The Executive Director Place believes that a leisure development at Parkwood is vitally important, not only for the regeneration of the City but also by creating jobs and business rates. It also fits with the City's aspirations to be an Outdoor City and promotes health and well-being for visitors and for local communities.

9.3.2 The reasons for the recommendations are to provide a way forward for the delivery of the Parkwood development

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Do Nothing

In this option the site of the former ski village would remain derelict and overgrown with the Council continuing to pick up all the associated holding/management costs including fly tipping, arson and anti- social uses.

9.4.2 Re-market the site

This option would remarket the site to find a new developer and operator. It would enable the Council to achieve the ambition as set out in the masterplan and bring the former ski village back into use as a major outdoor leisure destination venue,

capitalising on national trends towards outdoor recreation and reinforcing Sheffield's position as the UK's Outdoor City.

9.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

Councillor Douglas Johnson declared a personal interest as a member of the Friends of Parkwood Springs.

9.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

9.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

9.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

10. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN AND HRA BUDGET 2022/23

10.1 The report provided the 2022/23 update of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan. It included proposals to:

- Deliver our stock increase programme to build and acquire more council homes to meet our target of 3,100 homes by 2028/29
- Deliver improvements to our tenants' homes to make sure they continue to be well maintained
- Deliver year on year targets to achieve the 'Better Repairs Project'
- Invest in fire safety measures to ensure our council homes comply with the emerging building safety legislative environment
- Deliver on plans to ensure all Sheffield City Council homes reach Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) level C by 2030
- By 2022, produce a roadmap showing further options for council housing's contribution to achieving Sheffield's ambition of net-zero by 2030
- Focus on the quality of our customer service offer – improving customer access, the management of complaints and implementing recommendations from the Race Equality Commission
- Deliver improvements to the frontline neighbourhood housing services our tenants receive

- Work closely with Council colleagues to support the development of Local Area Committees across the city
- Consult with tenants over plans to charge for enhanced services and introduce cost recovery for some repair and housing management activities
- Develop apprenticeship, employment, and training opportunities to create a workforce representative of housing communities across the city
- Invest in updating our information technology infrastructure to seamlessly integrate with the wider Council systems
- Develop more agile ways of working as we learn to adapt post COVID-19 and address any remaining backlogs caused by the pandemic

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 2 February 2022 that it

1. Approves the HRA Business Plan report for 2022/23;
2. Approves the HRA Revenue Budget 2022/23 as set out in the financial appendix to the report;
3. Rents for council dwellings are increased by 4.1% from April 2022 in line with the Regulator of Social Housing's Rent Standard;
4. Rents for temporary accommodation are increased by 4.1% for 2022/23;
5. Garage rents for garage plots and garage sites are increased by 4.1% from April 2022;
6. The community heating kWh unit charge is increased from 3.04 pence to 5.69 pence from April 2022. The standing charge is also increased from £4.80 to £4.90 per week from April 2022;
7. The sheltered housing charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23;
8. The burglar alarm charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23; and
9. The furnished accommodation charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 To optimise the number of good quality affordable council homes in the city;
- 10.3.2 To maximise the financial resources to deliver key outcomes for tenants and the city in the context of a self-financing funding regime;
- 10.3.3 To ensure that tenants' homes continue to be well maintained and to optimise

investment in estates; and

10.3.4 To assure the long-term sustainability of council housing in Sheffield.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 Sheffield City Council has a statutory duty to produce an annual balanced HRA budget, which is evidenced by the business plan update, therefore no alternative option was considered to producing this report.

10.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

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

None

10.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, Place

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

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

NOTE: This is subject to approval at Full Council at its meeting to be held on 2nd February 2022 and is not subject to call-in.

11. **HOWDEN HOUSE PFI CONTRACT - REFINANCE**

11.1 The Howden House PFI contract ('the Contract') has been set a significant savings target in order to contribute to the Council achieving its challenging budget position and to deliver its workplace strategy.

This report seeks approval to the Council pursuing a contract Refinance to replace the current funder of the Howden House PFI contract with potential new funder, on more favourable terms and the introduction of an energy saving sharing mechanism in order to deliver a saving to the Council and to progress any necessary changes to the contract.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Approve the continuation of the Refinance process and dialogue with the potential new funders in order to determine the optimal route in terms of maximising savings and mitigating risks and subsequently take forward the preferred option;
2. Approve the ongoing dialogue with the DLUHC throughout the refinance process and to submit a business case seeking DLUHC/HMT approval to

- complete the refinance;
3. Approve the funding of any abortive project costs of the Refinance from Place revenue budget;
 4. Approve the variation of the Contract to allow the energy saving sharing mechanism;
 5. Delegates authority to the Executive Director of Resources to:
 - i. monitor the progress made by Council officers in determining the optimal refinancing option and approve (if appropriate) the recommended option; and
 - ii. review and authorise the submission of a business case to the DLUHC/HMT; and
 - iii. complete the refinance of the Contract subject to the approval of commercially acceptable terms by the Director of Legal and Governance; and
 6. Where no existing authority exists, delegates authority to the Executive Director of Resources, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance to take such steps to meet the aims and objectives of the report.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

- 11.3.1 The Howden House contract ('the Contract') has been set a significant savings target in order to contribute to the Council achieving its challenging budget position and delivery its workplace strategy.
- 11.3.2 The well-established nature of the contract makes it more attractive to the funding market and there are a limited number of competing relatively safe investments for funders in the current economic environment. These combine to give the Council a high chance of success in achieving a Refinance of the contract on the most favourable terms.
- 11.3.3 The Do-Nothing option will result in more pressure on achieving the Council's current and future budget and may result in more drastic cuts to front line services.
- 11.3.4 Failure to carry out the Refinance will result in more pressure on achieving the Council's current and future budget and may result in more drastic cuts to front line services. There is no evidence that deferring the Refinance will result in a more viable outcome in the future.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

11.4.1 Do Nothing

Under this option no further action would be taken now in relation to a Refinance or other contract changes and all activities would be stopped.

In this scenario the Council would have to bear the abortive transaction costs and would not generate the expected ongoing contract saving.

This would have the advantage of being able to carry out a Refinance in future years should the finance market be deemed to be more competitive.

However, there is no certainty that there would be an improvement on the current market conditions and the benefits of a refinance reduce with time as more of the debt is paid off at the current higher rates. This is particularly the case with a contract that only has 9 years remaining.

11.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

11.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

11.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

12. PATHWAYS PROGRAMME EXTENSIONS

12.1 To seek authority for Sheffield City Council to continue as the Accountable Body for the Ambition and Pathways to Success Projects and accept from the DWP additional grant allocations and extensions for the following projects: Ambition (£1.878m) and Pathways to Success (£1.714m) – ‘the Extensions’; and

In respect of Sheffield City Council’s participation in these projects as a delivery partner, the report seeks authority for the Council to procure and award contracts for employment services from the Voluntary and Community Sector.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. That the Council continues to act as the Accountable Body for the Ambition and Pathways to Success projects, accept the additional grant allocations and extensions for the following projects: Ambition (£1.878m) and Pathways to Success (£1.714m) - ‘the Extensions’; and
2. In respect of the Council’s participating in these projects as a delivery partner, the Council is authorised to procure and award contracts for employment support in Sheffield through open tender for contracts which in total will have a value of up to £1.636m.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 The Programme will directly support vulnerable residents to find and sustain employment.

The activities and outcomes of the Programme will directly contribute to the delivery of the One Year Plan:

- Communities and Neighbourhoods
- Education Health and Care
- Economy, climate change and development

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 The option to not apply for ‘the Extensions’ was considered before applying but rejected as the opportunity presents significant income generation from external sources to support our most vulnerable residents into employment.

12.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

12.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

12.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, People Services

12.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

13. MONTH 8 CAPITAL APPROVALS 2021/22

13.1 The report provided details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 8 2021/22. The report included changes to the Housing Capital Programme over the next 5 years.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Approve the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 (with the exception of Townhall Square Animation item in Section A) and Appendix 2, including the procurement strategies and delegate authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts;
2. Delegates authority to the Executive Director of Resources in

consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance to accept grant funding in respect of the Townhall Square Animation scheme and authorise inclusion of the related expenditure into the capital programme;

3. Approve the variations to the Housing Capital Programme as part of the annual programme refresh as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report;
4. Approve the acceptance of grants as detailed at Appendix 4 of the report; and
5. Approve the making of grants to 3rd Parties as detailed at Appendix 5 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

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.

13.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

13.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

13.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Resources

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

14. APPOINTMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT CHAIR OF THE LOCAL INQUIRY INTO THE STREET TREES DISPUTE

14.1 The report set out:

- the context for the commitment in the Co-operative Agreement to “appoint an independent person to conduct a local non-statutory inquiry into the management of the street trees dispute”;
- the work undertaken during 2021 to carry out this commitment;
- the recommended outcome of the recruitment process to identify a suitable Independent Chair; and
- a financial envelope for the inquiry.

14.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Note the work conducted to establish a firmly independent inquiry into the street trees dispute;
2. Delegate authority to the Chief Executive and Director of Finance and Commercial Services to take the necessary steps to secure Sir Mark Lowcock as the Independent Chair of the Inquiry, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Community Engagement and Governance; and
3. Agree that the Co-operative Executive receive a further report with details of financial implications of the Terms of Reference once developed by the Independent Chair and agreed by the stakeholders.

14.3 **Reasons for Decision**

14.3.1 The appointment of an independent person to conduct a local inquiry into the street trees dispute fulfils a commitment in the Labour and Green Co-operation Agreement.

14.3.2 A rigorous assessment process has identified Sir Mark Lowcock as the recommended candidate for this role.

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

14.4.1 The need for an independent Inquiry was included in the May 2021 Labour and Green Co-operation Agreement. No alternative to meeting that requirement was considered.

14.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

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

None

14.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Resources

14.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

15. SHEFFIELD (LOCAL) PLAN SPATIAL OPTIONS

15.1 The report set out the overall spatial options for meeting future development needs in Sheffield in the period to 2039 and to conduct the cross-party engagement process regarding the approach as agreed in October 2021. The overall aim of that process is for the Council to reach a decision on a preferred approach in advance of producing the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan (to be published for public consultation in October 2022).

15.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. notes the advice provided by the Climate Change, Economy and Development Transitional Committee to support Option 3 (as set out in the report) as the preferred overall spatial option that should be taken forward in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan; and
2. In accordance with the agreed cross party engagement process, refers the report to full Council for a view on whether Option 3 or one of the other four options should be supported prior to making the final decision.

15.3 Reasons for Decision

15.3.1 Officers require a clear steer on the preferred approach before the details can be worked in the full Publication Draft Plan and before further public consultation takes place in autumn 2022.

15.3.2 The options set out in this report mean there are difficult choices to be made between social, economic and environmental objectives and a thorough cross-party engagement process is desired to mitigate the risk of the draft plan being rejected by full Council at a later stage.

15.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

15.4.1 The main spatial options relating to the scale and location of future development are already set out in sections 1.6 and 1.7 of the report.

15.4.2 Officers could have worked on producing the Publication Draft Local Plan without seeking a specific Member steer on the overall spatial approach. However, to date, it has proved difficult to build a consensus on what is the correct approach for the city; in particular, there has been considerable concern on whether land should be removed from the Green Belt in order to provide more land for

development. Without a thorough cross-party engagement process on the overall spatial approach, there would be a very significant risk of the Publication Draft Plan being rejected by full Council.

15.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

15.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

15.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

15.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

NOTE: This is subject to approval at Full Council at its meeting to be held on 2nd February 2022 and is not subject to call-in.

16. GLEADLESS VALLEY MASTERPLAN

- 16.1
1. To provide update information on the Gleadless Valley regeneration proposals including presentation of the draft Masterplan for inspection.
 2. To seek authority to consult the community on the draft proposals as set out in the Masterplan. The masterplan work has now reached a stage where, following co-production with members and the community, the proposals for regenerating the estate can be shared with all residents and stakeholders in order to take their informed views and opinions into a formal consultation process.
 3. To explain that the proposals have been costed and the principles / projects have been agreed by the Gleadless Valley Member Steering Group and the Engagement Forum.
 4. To summarise the Masterplan proposes which in summary includes:
 - a. A plan and a programme of improvements to deliver the agreed vision for Gleadless Valley that will stimulate the regeneration of this area.
 - b. How the area will see improvements across the main workstream areas including:
 - i. An additional 138 homes of high quality that will contribute to reductions in CO2 emissions
 - i. Greater choice of types of homes, more homes with secure gardens and community gardens where desired, more supported housing for older people
 - ii. Well maintained maisonette blocks with higher thermal performance,

- iii. secure and upgraded communal areas and modern waste facilities
 - iii. Green spaces that further enhance the parkland setting and build on the great work that stakeholders and residents have already done to promote biodiversity and protect ecology
 - iv. Additional play facilities for all age groups and better distributed across the valley
 - v. Green space and landscape improvements that both provide better connectivity across the valley, provide focal points, private gardens where desired and, community garden areas
 - vi. A range of initiatives to maximise training and employment opportunities through the delivery of the physical housing and public realm projects
 - vii. Improvements to the local centres
 - viii. Addressing and facilitating improvements to the local centres
 - ix. Parking improvements and traffic calming in areas residents have identified as a concern
5. To explain how and when the consultation on the Masterplan will be undertaken and that a further report on the Masterplan will be brought forward in March 2022 provides a summary of the consultation feedback.
6. To give assurance that consultation plans have taken into consideration the implications of Covid 19 and that should there be a further national lockdown how the plans for consultation may be impacted.
7. To explain that consideration of the feedback from the community on the proposals will enable the Council to make further decisions and any appropriate modifications on the regeneration Masterplan and the resources required to be committed to delivering the final plan.

16.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

Notes and approves:

1. The draft Masterplan proposals as summarised in sections 6,7,8, and 9 and appended in its entirety in the closed part of the report;
2. That the Masterplan proposals be shared with the residents of Gleadless Valley for the purposes of consultation as set out in that document;
3. That the period of consultation with residents commences on 24th January 2022 and will continue until the expiry of 6 (six) weeks;
4. That the Council shall commit to the “Timeline” set out in the Masterplan as to consideration of the feedback from consultation and completion thereafter of the final form of the regeneration Masterplan for launching later in 2022; and
5. That a further report on the responses from the consultation and proposed final form of the regeneration Masterplan be brought back to the Co-operative Executive in March 2022. The Council will then consider:

- a. the consultation feedback received,
- b. the proposed content of the Masterplan (modified as appropriate following consideration of consultation feedback) and
- c. the associated policy and cost implications for the Council.

16.3 Reasons for Decision

- 16.3.1 The Council embarked on the masterplan work in 2017 following a grant bid submission to Government for Estate Regeneration Funding. A fundamental requirement of the grant bid and best practice in estate regeneration is that the communities affected should be engaged in the development and implementation of masterplans. The Council has promised it would consult on the masterplan.
- 16.3.2 The proposals for the masterplan have now reached an advanced stage and have been co-produced with members and community. These proposals need to be shared widely and feedback invited so that the Council can reflect on the feedback and how it wishes to take this forward in the masterplan.
- 16.3.3 The outcomes of the consultation will be:
- a. All residents and stakeholders on Gleadless Valley have an opportunity to provide feedback
 - b. Feedback will be received by the council, analysed, and shared with Council Members
 - c. Members will reflect on the feedback and determine how the feedback should be used to refine the final Masterplan
 - d. A final Masterplan will be published and presented to the Corporate Executive

16.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 16.4.1 Further delaying any consultation with the community at this time due to the increase in COVID infections until it is perceived that COVID 19 infections have reduced to an acceptable level.

Risk assessments have been undertaken relating to the activity of engagement and safeguards and a range of engagement options have been developed to address concerns. It is difficult to provide absolute certainty to the community as to when would be the right time given the nature of this public health risk. Delaying the consultation any further has a high risk of the community losing faith with the Council on this project as they have invested in this work and homes are in urgent need of improvement.

- 16.4.2 Abandon any plans to consult on the Masterplan.

The masterplan has been in development for over 4 years and was funded by a grant bid in 2017 to Government. If the plan was not consulted upon Sheffield City Council may be at risk at central government requesting that the grant be repaid under the grant conditions. The grant was £515,000 and repaying the grant would impact on other council services. This has been rejected.

16.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

16.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

16.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

16.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

This page is intentionally left blank