



**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Jill Hurst, Head of Housing Investment and Maintenance

**Tel:** 0114 2735493

---

**Report of:** *Executive Director of Place*

**Report to:** *Corporate Executive*

**Date of Decision:** *24<sup>th</sup> March 2022*

**Subject:** *Gleadless Valley Masterplan Consultation Feedback and Approval*

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Which Executive Member Portfolio does this relate to? Councillor Paul Wood Executive Member for Housing, Roads and Waste Management

Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? *Not applicable*

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? Yes  No

If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? 1167

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes  No

If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-

## Purpose of the Report

1. To share the community feedback from the consultation on the draft Masterplan for Gleadless Valley,
2. To outline what is supported by the community and if there are any areas where there is a less support from those most affected in the community.
3. To confirm the blocks that will be replaced or remodelled as part of this Masterplan and to note that a Local Lettings Policy will be needed that will give preference to residents with a demolition priority to enable them to stay within the area.

4. Seek approval for the Masterplan and authorise the Director of Housing to make non material changes to the draft Masterplan and publish a Final Masterplan
5. To seek approval for a number of delegations to the Director of Housing and the Head of Regeneration and Property that are needed to implement the Masterplan

**Recommendations:**

**This report recommends that the Corporate Executive should:**

1. Consider carefully the feedback from the community consultation on the draft Masterplan for Gleadless Valley and have regard to it in making decisions on matters addressed in this report.
2. Agrees the Masterplan and Authorises the Director of Housing to make non-material changes to the plan based on the feedback that has been received
3. Authorise the Director of Housing to make arrangements to progress the implementation of Gleadless Valley Masterplan into the delivery of works phase and bring forward individual projects for approval in line with the Councils capital approval process.
4. Authorises the Director of Housing to publish a final Masterplan by end June 2022.
5. Delegates to the Director of Housing in consultation with the Corporate Executive Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety and pursuant to the Leaders Scheme of Delegation to:
  - a. Agree and implement the arrangements for ceasing the letting of empty properties and when to begin the clearance process in accordance with the phasing programme to be determined.
  - b. Agree and implement the arrangements for awarding priority for rehousing in line with the Allocations Policy for those residents affected by demolition or remodelling in line with the phasing programme to be agreed.
  - c. Agree and implement a Local Lettings Policy that will give preference to residents with a demolition priority to enable them to stay within the area subject to eligibility.
6. Authorises the Head of Regeneration and Property to verify and validate statutory compensation claims of qualifying tenants and residents displaced under these phased schemes, and thereafter pay qualifying persons (1)

discretionary home-loss payments, and (2) discretionary payments to cover any removal expenses.

7. Approves that the Head of Regeneration and Property Services be authorised to (1) negotiate and agree terms for the acquisition of dwellings listed which are not owned by the City Council and, (2) to instruct the Director of Legal and Governance to complete the necessary legal documentation in respect of the acquisition of such properties
8. Approves that the Head of Regeneration and Property Services Property be authorised to make statutory home-loss payments to qualifying owner occupiers and tenants of private landlords and to make other necessary and lawful payments of compensation to owners of property being purchased.
9. Approves that the Regeneration and Property Services be authorised to (1) negotiate the surrender of any commercial leases including electrical substations, telecommunications and other service equipment as required (2) to instruct the Director of Legal and Governance to complete the necessary legal documentation.

**Background Papers:**

*(Insert details of any background papers used in the compilation of the report.)*

Draft Masterplan  
 Gleadless Valley Engagement Summary  
 Stakeholder Feedback Written Submissions  
 Interviews with residents  
 Paper and Online Survey Results

Lead Officer to complete: -		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: <i>Karen Jones, Finance Business Partner</i>
		Legal: <i>Stephen Tonge, Solicitor, Corporate Governance</i>
		Equalities: <i>Louise Nunn, Place Business Strategy</i>
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b>	<i>Mick Crofts</i>

3	<b>Executive Member consulted:</b>	<i>Councillor Paul Wood</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b>  <i>Janet Sharpe</i>	<b>Job Title:</b>  <i>Director of Housing</i>
	<b>Date:</b> <i>17<sup>th</sup> March 2022</i>	

<b>1.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Summary</b>
1.1.2	This report provides the feedback obtained from the community consultation on the draft Gleadless Valley Masterplan. It outlines where there is support for the proposals, highlights the requests for substantive changes and if such changes are recommended or not for inclusion in the Masterplan.
1.1.3	The report confirms the key elements and impacts for residents to move forward with the Masterplan on Gleadless Valley.
1.1.4	A number of officer delegations are recommended to enable the Officers to implement the workstreams described in the Masterplan. Each specific capital project within the Masterplan will follow the Council's approval process to secure the funding needed.
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Background</b>
1.2.1	The Council embarked on the Masterplan work in 2017 for Gleadless Valley following a grant bid 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.
1.2.2	In late 2021 the proposals for the Masterplan reached an advanced stage having been co-produced with members and community. These proposals needed to be shared widely and feedback invited. Approval was given in January

	<p>2022 to proceed with consulting on the draft Masterplan. The purpose and objective of the consultation was</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To enable all residents and stakeholders on Gleadless Valley to consider the Masterplan and provide feedback</li> <li>b. That all feedback received by the council would be analysed, and shared with Council Members</li> <li>c. That Council Members would consider the feedback and have regard to it to when determining whether or not to proceed with the Masterplan and, if proceeding, whether any changes to it were necessary.</li> </ol>
<p><b>1.3</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of the Masterplan that has been consulted upon</b></p>
<p>1.3.1</p>	<p>The draft Masterplan document shared with the public was a self-contained document prepared by the Council's professional consultants who are expert and experienced in such key regeneration engagement work. It was specifically prepared for this phase of the consultation process. The draft Masterplan is a separate document to this report and was shared with members in January 2022.</p>
<p>1.3.2</p>	<p>The draft Masterplan aimed to give readers sufficient background on how the Masterplan was co-produced with the community and it provided clear, detailed, and understandable information supported by helpful and well set out maps, plans and specifications on all aspects of the regeneration proposed. It also included indicative designs of various homes and site plans of green space improvements. The document was constructed to allow the reader to consider specifically "<i>what's happening in my area?</i>"</p>
<p>1.3.3</p>	<p>The Masterplan document included a summary of proposed improvements across the main workstream areas including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. An additional 138 homes of high quality that will contribute to reductions in CO2 emissions</li> <li>ii. Greater choice of types of homes, more homes with secure gardens, more supported housing for older people</li> <li>iii. Well maintained maisonette blocks with higher thermal performance, secure and upgraded communal areas and modern waste facilities</li> <li>iv. Green spaces that further enhance the parkland setting and build on the great work that stakeholders</li> </ol>

	<p>and residents have already done to promote biodiversity and protect ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Additional play facilities for all age groups and better distributed across the valley</li> <li>vi. Green space and landscape improvements that both provide better connectivity across the valley, provide focal points, private gardens where desired and, community garden areas</li> <li>vii. A range of initiatives to maximise training and employment opportunities through the delivery of the physical housing and public realm projects</li> <li>viii. Improvements to the local centres</li> <li>ix. Parking improvements and traffic calming in areas residents have identified as a concern</li> </ul>
1.3.4	<p>The period of consultation with residents commenced on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2022 and expired on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2022, this six-week period is in line with the <i>Consultation Principles and Involvement Guide</i>. The Council is required by statute and under the terms of its tenancy agreements to consult with its tenants in this matter. Full details of the consultation taken during the life of the Masterplan development and during the consultation period are explained in section 3 and Appendix 1 of the report.</p>
1.4	<p><b>Feedback on the Masterplan – Categories of Feedback</b></p>
1.4.1	<p>Appendix 1 provides a summary of the engagement undertaken, who with, how and the level of feedback given. The appended data is an accurate compiled summary of the feedback and validated as such by the Director of Housing. This feedback has been analyzed based on the way it was collected and more detailed breakdown of each category of feedback is provided in specific sections 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 below. The main categories of feedback are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Feedback from residents whose homes it is proposed are replaced and remodeled and landlords who would lose their property these are the people most affected by the masterplan. This was captured via surveys on face-to-face visits / interviews, telephone calls and video calls. The data is summarized in Appendix 2</li> <li>b. Feedback via online and paper surveys from residents and stakeholders. This data is summarized in Appendix 2</li> </ul>

	<p>c. Feedback from stakeholder groups either in writing or captured directly by officers</p>																	
1.4.2	<p>Feedback given in a and b above also provided residents the opportunity to give additional free text comments in addition to the specific questions and this has been themed to give more insight into the views of individual residents. For full details see Appendix 2</p>																	
1.4.3	<p>There was also ad-hoc feedback through emails and telephone calls. Most of this was one off observations but officers have noted where the feedback given is reinforcing similar feedback through the formal feedback processes. For full details see Appendix 2</p>																	
1.5	<p><b>Feedback From Residents Whose Homes Will Be Replaced</b></p>																	
1.5.1	<p>Under the detailed housing proposals in the draft Masterplan there are 242 homes (all tenures) that would be replaced as a result of either demolition or remodeling. The residents in these homes would receive a rehousing priority and be entitled to financial support depending on their security of tenure / ownership status. The specific blocks are:</p> <p><b>Renewal (demolition) proposed:</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>380-418 Leighton Road, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>45-63 Middle Hay Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>25-43 Middle Hay Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>40-70 Middle Hay View, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>72-100 Middle Hay View, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>102-128 Middle Hay View, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>26-40 Sands Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>2-24 Sands Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>1-23 Sands Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>25-47 Sands Close, Sheffield</td></tr> </table> <p><b>Remodelling proposed:</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr><td>1-15, Plowright Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>17-39, Plowright Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>41-55, Plowright Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>57-79, Plowright Close, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>2-24, Spring Close View, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>66-88, Spring Close Mount, Sheffield</td></tr> <tr><td>50-64, Spring Close Mount, Sheffield</td></tr> </table>	380-418 Leighton Road, Sheffield	45-63 Middle Hay Close, Sheffield	25-43 Middle Hay Close, Sheffield	40-70 Middle Hay View, Sheffield	72-100 Middle Hay View, Sheffield	102-128 Middle Hay View, Sheffield	26-40 Sands Close, Sheffield	2-24 Sands Close, Sheffield	1-23 Sands Close, Sheffield	25-47 Sands Close, Sheffield	1-15, Plowright Close, Sheffield	17-39, Plowright Close, Sheffield	41-55, Plowright Close, Sheffield	57-79, Plowright Close, Sheffield	2-24, Spring Close View, Sheffield	66-88, Spring Close Mount, Sheffield	50-64, Spring Close Mount, Sheffield
380-418 Leighton Road, Sheffield																		
45-63 Middle Hay Close, Sheffield																		
25-43 Middle Hay Close, Sheffield																		
40-70 Middle Hay View, Sheffield																		
72-100 Middle Hay View, Sheffield																		
102-128 Middle Hay View, Sheffield																		
26-40 Sands Close, Sheffield																		
2-24 Sands Close, Sheffield																		
1-23 Sands Close, Sheffield																		
25-47 Sands Close, Sheffield																		
1-15, Plowright Close, Sheffield																		
17-39, Plowright Close, Sheffield																		
41-55, Plowright Close, Sheffield																		
57-79, Plowright Close, Sheffield																		
2-24, Spring Close View, Sheffield																		
66-88, Spring Close Mount, Sheffield																		
50-64, Spring Close Mount, Sheffield																		

Morland Road	189-199, 201-211, 165-175, 177-187
Leighton Drive	97-107, 109-119, 73-83, 85-95,25-35, 37-47, 1-11, 13-23

1.5.2 In the last six weeks of the 242 households affected 153 (all tenures) were consulted in person directly, this represents 63% of all homes. The detailed breakdown is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Tenure	Number Consulted in person directly	Percentage
Council Tenant	141	65%
Private Tenant	2	20%
Homeowner	5	100%
Leasehold Landlord	5	50%

1.5.3 Of the 141 council tenants consulted in person 58% of respondents were aware of the Masterplan, however this awareness ranged significantly between the different areas of Gleadless Valley. Plowright residents have been the most aware of the Masterplan. Over half of respondents in Herding's were unaware of the Masterplan. Section 3 of this report summarises the engagement plans since 2018 that has taken place across all parts of Gleadless Valley including Herdings and so this difference is surprising and a lack of engagement in this area has not previously been highlighted.

1.5.4 The majority of home owners and private tenants were aware of the Masterplan but a minority of Leasehold landlords were aware of the Masterplan

1.5.5 **Overall, 80% of all respondents support the proposals for the areas of Gleadless Valley they live in.** 7% of respondents are neutral and 12% oppose the proposals. Homeowners and Leasehold landlords are less supportive of the Masterplan proposals for these homes.

1.5.6 A question was asked about where a household would wish to be rehoused to and this indicated 47% of tenant respondents want to remain in Gleadless Valley, compared to 60% of owner occupiers. 27% of tenant respondents want to move out of Gleadless Valley.



1.5.7	Comments on this question provide some insight into why residents want to remain in Gleadless Valley <b>or</b> do not want remain. In either case the common themes are to be close to schools, wanting to be near friends and family or have a connection with an area.
1.5.8	A further question asked what a householders preferred future tenure option would be when they were rehoused. 72% of current council tenants wished to remain a council tenant, some tenants expressed an interest in accessing the Right to Buy (RTB) discount to purchase their home.
1.5.9	80% of owner-occupiers interviewed are interested in becoming council tenants as a rehousing option. The comments section of the survey indicated that some owner-occupier are concerned that even with home loss compensation they may still have to downsize or be unable to afford another mortgage due to getting the property originally with a RTB discount / or other external factors will affect them securing a new mortgage.
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Feedback From Wider Masterplan Online and Paper Surveys</b>
1.6.1	Online and paper based surveys were another mechanism that was as used to capture feedback on the Masterplan. Respondents to the surveys were able to indicate whether they liked or did not like the proposals and they were also able to make free text comments.
1.6.2	94 surveys were received that asked questions about wider draft Masterplan, the general plans for housing, the green spaces, services and employment and skills. This figure represents only 2 percent of all 4600 homes on Gleadless Valley. This is a disappointing response rate for a regeneration project and much lower than the 63% response rate for those affected most by the proposals. Extensive efforts that were made to encourage surveys, the engagement activities and the recent coverage in the local press. See Appendix 1 for full details of the engagement activity
1.6.3	Some of the feedback on the Masterplan indicates some are sceptical the masterplan will be delivered. The plan has been in development longer than ever planned and this may have impacted on the communities being interested in completing surveys. The numbers attending in person events where paper surveys could have been completed

	<p>may have also been impacted by Covid 19 during the consultation period.</p>
1.6.4	<p>Of the 4600 homes only 2464 homes remain in council ownership and of these only 25% are directly impacted by the specific housing proposals, such as refurbishment and replacement housing. All residents are impacted by the proposals for the green spaces, facilities, employment and skills.</p>
1.6.5	<p>Respondents were able to indicate whether they liked or did not like the proposals and they were also able to make comments. 75% of those that did complete the wider survey live on Gleadless Valley, 14% of respondents did not answer this question, with the remaining numbers having some connection to Gleadless Valley, friends, family, work etc. The survey did no</p>
1.6.6	<p>This wider survey did not ask whether respondents supported or did not support the Masterplan but it asked what they liked and did not like, these have been broken down by the four strategies and in section 8 the report sets out the recommended responses.</p>
1.6.7	<p>The top themes people <b>liked</b> about the <b>housing proposals</b> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving the external appearance of housing</li> <li>• Improving the quality and standard of housing</li> <li>• The possibility of private gardens</li> <li>• The area will be modernised</li> <li>• The proposals will make people feel safer</li> </ul>
1.6.8	<p>The things people <b>liked least</b> about the housing proposals were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient parking improvements</li> <li>• That views may be obscured by new housing</li> <li>• That anti- social behaviour issues are not a higher priority</li> <li>• That existing homes should be tackled first</li> <li>• Uncertainty about rehousing issues</li> </ul>
1.6.9	<p>Overall, the majority of respondents liked the specific housing proposals or at least part of these.</p>
1.6.10	<p>The top themes people <b>liked</b> about the <b>green space proposals</b> are:</p>

1.6.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildflower planting and more trees</li> <li>• Improving walking routes and footpaths</li> <li>• Increased parking</li> <li>• Improving wildlife</li> <li>• The proposals will improve the image of the area</li> </ul> <p>The overriding top 3 issues people <b>liked least</b> about the green space proposals were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about long term maintenance</li> <li>• Concerns about anti-social behaviour in green spaces including use of quad bikes.</li> <li>• Losing underused green space for new housing</li> </ul>
1.6.12	<p>Overall, the majority of respondents liked the green space proposals or at least part of these.</p>
1.6.13	<p>The top themes people <b>liked</b> about the <b>employment and skills and services proposals</b> are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More activities for young people</li> <li>• Improvements at Gaunt Road shops</li> <li>• Help to improve employment and skills</li> <li>• Working with community organisations</li> </ul>
1.6.14	<p>The overriding top 2 issues people <b>liked least</b> about the <b>employment and skills and services</b> proposals were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about anti-social behaviour and drug issues</li> <li>• Bus routes must be improved</li> </ul>
1.6.15	<p>Overall, the majority of respondents liked the employment and skills proposals but due to the lack of responses on the services part of the survey it is not possible to say whether people support or do not support this part of the Masterplan proposals.</p>
1.7	<p><b>Feedback From Stakeholders on the Masterplan</b></p>
1.7.1	<p>The Gleadless Valley project team have developed links with a number of stakeholders since the work began in 2018 and these Stakeholders were invited to a short briefing just</p>

before the formal consultation was launched. The feedback from stakeholders on the Masterplan has taken the form of written submissions in various formats or has been collated in the case of children / young people from officers taking discussion notes in face-to-face classroom sessions.

Feedback has been received from:

- Gleadless Valley Wildlife Trust (GVWT)
- SCC PRoW (linked to the Ramblers)
- Sheffield Local Access Forum
- Peak and Northern Footpath Society
- Sheffield Climate Alliance
- Shelter
- Heeley City Farm
- Newfield Secondary School children
- Bankwood Community Primary School children
- SCC – Ecology Service

1.7.2

All the feedback has been very useful, and Officers will provide feedback to each organisation on each element that has been raised. The feedback will also be summarised and made public on the Council website.

1.7.3

Approximately 150 feedback observations were received. Officers have reviewed all the feedback and this varies in significance to the Masterplan and to illustrate the type and range examples are given below in the Table 2. Items that fall into rows 1 to 5 in the table have been assessed as being non material to the approval of the Masterplan and can be addressed by minor edits under the direction of a senior officer in the Housing and Neighbourhoods Service or can be progressed in the implementation phase should the Masterplan be approved by members.

1.7.4

Members of the Gleadless Valley Steering Group had the opportunity to consider the feedback of most significance on 8<sup>th</sup> March that fall into rows 6 and 7 of Table 2 and the conclusions reached at that meeting for consideration by the Cooperative Executive are set out in Table 3 on page 16. The Steering Group is made up of the three local ward councillors and Cllr Paul Wood, the group has met since 2018 to help guide officers on the Masterplan development.

Table 2

No	Type of Feedback Given	Typical Examples of Feedback Received from Stakeholders
----	------------------------	---

1	Seeking clarification, a question has been asked that needs a response	Can residents receive a disturbance payment advance ?
2	Suggestions for minor text changes within the draft Masterplan	Plan should make reference to overheating on page 6
3	Suggestions for correcting things in the draft Masterplan that are an error or have unintended consequences or were omitted	A green space site is not shown on the Masterplan
4	The feedback is seeking further engagement as the Masterplan moves into a detailed project planning and delivery phase	If the masterplan is approved, we could look to support the employment and skills strand of the masterplan.
5	The feedback is more relevant for officers / to take into account at the delivery stage of projects being developed	Footpath SHE/339 is a cul de sac, is there scope or possibility that it could somehow continue towards Hemsworth?
6	Suggestions for significant change to the Masterplan or specific projects	Request for the Masterplan boundary to be changed
7	What stakeholders like / do not like with the Masterplan	Inclusion of a specific new build site development

1.7.5

Overall, the Stakeholder feedback indicates that the investment at Gleadless Valley is welcomed by the organisations. This feedback can be grouped into a number of themes that were conveyed to us by more than one stakeholder. In section 1.8 these issues are responded to alongside the feedback from the resident and wider consultation.

Need for more play areas and community facilities spread across the valley	Anti – social behaviour is a concern; the masterplan does not fix this	Housing improvements are welcomed, it's the thing in Gleadless Valley we like the least
Wildlife areas need to be protected with buffer zones, concern about building on underused land	Willingness from multiple groups to work with SCC to realise the masterplan goals	Support for a map of the ecology being produced
Anxieties for young and old about moving home, people will need to be supported	Mapping and improving footpaths and links across the valley will help accessibility	Waste management problems / amount of litter on the estate

1.8

**What will the final Masterplan for Gleadless Valley Look Like?**


1.8.1.

**Masterplan Vision**

“Our vision for Gleadless Valley is for it to continue to be a great place to live, grow up and grow older, with fantastic green spaces and good quality housing, it will have a strong sense of community spirit and allow its residents to thrive”.

1.8.2

The consultation feedback has provided a fair level support for the above although the number of responses was low there was not overall high levels of negativity. Stakeholder feedback shows that the community cares about what happens at Gleadless Valley and a desire to be fully engaged in the next stage of this work. The next section of the report will consider the feedback given in section 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 and outline how this feedback will be utilised.



1.8.3

**Housing Proposals – Response to Feedback and Implications**

1.8.4

The draft Masterplan housing proposals for Gleadless Valley as published would provide a greater choice of high-quality homes for all ages and, household make up, provide an improved neighbourhood utilising the infrastructure and quality of green space and local infrastructure. There will be more homes with gardens and larger homes to address

	overcrowding issues as well as supported housing for older households.
1.8.5	The feedback from those who were directly consulted on the proposals for their home (addresses listed page 8) showed overall 80% percentage were in favour of replacement housing for those areas. If the Masterplan was approved, at the appropriate time in the programme, the Council would declare demolition of specific blocks and this subject to eligibility would trigger the award of a demolition priority to each household under the Council's Allocation Policy section 4.7.
1.8.6	Approximately 50% of residents would like to remain in the Gleadless Valley area to remain near family and to allow children to attend current schools. The feedback from school children highlighted some anxiety about moving home and whether they could stay in the area but they also felt the housing was something that needed most money spending on it. Rehousing concerns were also flagged as a concern in the wider consultation survey. 75% of existing council tenants affected also wish to remain as council tenants.
1.8.7	The draft Masterplan suggested that a Local Lettings Policy would be developed to support residents being able to stay in the area and the demand from the community to stay in the area, from the feedback received certainly reinforces the need for this. Section 4.23 of the Council's Allocation Policy describes that a Local Lettings Policy may be developed in certain circumstances. One example given is where applicants have been awarded a demolition priority and are wishing to remain in the same area. Local Lettings Policies need to be evidence-based and they cover defined geographic areas. Officers have developed some initial ideas for a Local Lettings Policy for Gleadless Valley that includes a time limited second demolition priority but such a scheme needs further development and would be considered in accordance with the Leaders Scheme of Delegation.
1.8.8	At the appropriate time if the Masterplan is approved arrangements will be made to cease the letting of empty properties, this will enable the clearance process to begin in accordance with the phasing programme to be determined.
1.8.9	A household may be entitled to home loss payment if they are displaced from a dwelling on any land as a result of a demolition order, a compulsory purchase order, redevelopment or where an order is made for possession

	<p>because of demolition or redevelopment. This is covered by <i>s.29 Land Compensation Act 1973, as amended by para 3, Sch.15 Housing Act 2004</i>. This will apply subject to eligibility to the homes listed on page 8 should the Masterplan be approved. Owners are entitled to receive 10 per cent of the market value of their home, up to a prescribed maximum amount. Other applicants (including local authority and private tenants) are entitled to a prescribed flat rate payment. The prescribed amounts are revised from time to time and depend on when the person is displaced from their home.</p>
1.8.10	<p>Disturbance payments would also be paid to compensate a residents for reasonable expenses in moving from the house or land. People who do not qualify for a home loss payment, for example because they do not satisfy the residence requirement, may be entitled to a disturbance payment. Budget provision has been made for these payments as part of the Masterplan budget.</p>
1.8.11	<p>There are currently a small number of leasehold properties with owners in occupation or let out by the landlord within scope of the masterplan. By a small margin the majority of these were not supportive of the demolition and remodelling proposals. This report recognises the and the Gleadless Valley Project Team / Leasehold Services Team will range of financial concerns expressed by this group work with Leaseholders to develop plans to address these concerns. Owner occupiers maybe able to access Relocation Loans to help bridge the gap between the value of their current property and a new property.</p>
1.8.12	<p>A range of new housing options will be available for residents affected by remodelling and replacement to take up that will avoid them having to be displaced. Furthermore, the Council has firm plans through its stock increase programme to build 426 new homes in the local area over the next 5 years. This will also go towards mitigating the impact of these regeneration proposals to avoid any (unwanted) displacement from Gleadless Valley</p>
1.8.13	<p>The wider consultation also indicated that people liked the proposed improvements to existing homes, and new homes improve the quality of the housing offer, they liked the external appearance improvements, the provision of car parking and stated it would make them feel safer. One stakeholder Shelter also welcomed <i>“more houses with personal gardens for residents and increased safety and security</i></p>



<p>1.8.14</p> <p>.8.15</p> <p>1.8.16</p> <p>1.8.17</p> <p>1.8.18</p>	<p><i>for maisonettes. More housing is something we need across Sheffield”.</i></p> <p>A small number of leaseholders are affected by the proposed refurbishment of the blocks and in accordance with their lease the Council would seek (through the required statutory consultation processes) to recover from leaseholders their proportion of the costs of eligible works.</p> <p>Leaseholders may be eligible for mandatory / discretionary loans provided by the Council as a deferred debt if they find themselves unable to pay in full the service charge bills. The bills can be paid in instalments and the “loan” will be secured by a charge on the property.</p> <p>Feedback also highlighted some concerns about the impact of new homes on green space and views may be obscured and there could wildlife impact on a number of small sites in the Masterplan. In Table 3 Stakeholder feedback requested that two of the new build sites be removed from the Masterplan. Officers and the Gleadless Valley Steering Group feel this removal is premature and through a robust feasibility, design and stakeholder process we will develop a strong, clear communication strategy during the next phase of the Masterplan to convey the efforts that the City Council will go to protect and enhance the green space, ensure it complies with legislation and make clear the reasons for building on any greenspace.</p> <p>Across the wider consultation feedback and individual feedback there were positive comments about planned parking projects that had responded to earlier consultation on Gleadless Valley. But in addition the recent consultation has indicated more parking provision may be needed in the Masterplan area. Particular areas highlighted are Overend and Bankwood. In these areas and also at Spotswood there are also calls for road safety improvements such as barriers and speed bumps. Officers will raise these issues with the appropriate authorities and services post Masterplan approval.</p> <p>Summary of Housing Proposals to go in the Final Masterplan</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Proposal</th> <th>Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Older Persons Independent Living Scheme, 80 apartments at Hemsworth</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Proposal	Details		Older Persons Independent Living Scheme, 80 apartments at Hemsworth
Proposal	Details				
	Older Persons Independent Living Scheme, 80 apartments at Hemsworth				

	<p><b>Housing Growth schemes – new homes on land already allocated to housing</b> (already at planning stage)</p> <p><b>Infill housing</b> (New build housing on space in between and around existing homes)</p> <p><b>Housing Renewal</b></p> <p><b>Remodelling</b> (Remodelling of existing blocks to create different sizes/types of homes)</p> <p><b>Refurbishment (51 blocks)</b> (External refurbishment of existing blocks and communal areas)</p>	<p><b>New build houses at Gaunt Road</b></p> <p><b>Across a number of sites 109 new build houses and apartments</b> See pages 7&amp;8 draft masterplan</p> <p><b>Replacement of 10 blocks of maisonettes and replacement with 88 new houses and apartments</b> <b>Sands Close, Middlehay Close and View, Leighton Road</b> See pages 9-10 draft masterplan</p> <p><b>Remodelling of 52 ground floor maisonettes into 36 3-bed town houses and 16 2 bed maisonettes</b> <b>Plowright Close, Spring Close Mount &amp; View</b></p> <p><b>Remodelling of 1 bed flats in 4 bed town houses</b> <b>Leighton Road &amp; Drive, Morland Road</b> See pages 11-14 draft masterplan</p> <p><b>51 blocks, 624 homes</b> <b>Plowright, Ironside, Blackstock, Constable, Mawfa, Spring Close View, Spotswood, Leighton, Abney, Newfield Green</b> See page 14 draft masterplan</p>
1.8.19	<p>No material changes are proposed at this stage to the housing proposals in the Masterplan. This section described some of the operational arrangements and policies that are needed to progress the housing regeneration plans, therefore a number of delegations to the Director of Housing and the Head of Regeneration and Property are set out in the recommendations section of the report.</p>	
1.8.20	<p><b>Green and Open Space Proposals and Implications</b></p>	
1.8.21	<p>Green spaces, a parkland feel, and ancient woodlands are integral to the Gleadless Valley estate. In partnership with the community, a Valley-wide strategy has been developed to guide investment in green and open spaces, covering a wide range of objectives such as tackling tenancy breaches and inappropriate behaviour, the promotion of biodiversity and increasing opportunities for recreation and play.</p>	

	<p>Projects range from pocket parks to an ambition to achieve Green Flag status for its naturalistic green spaces.</p>															
1.8.22	<p>The consultation feedback has reinforced the importance the community, give to green spaces , it is one of the things most people like about Gleadless Valley now. There is a strong desire for protecting the existing wildlife, woodlands being enhanced, better access and maintaining green links,</p>															
1.8.23	<p>The community do not want to see trees being removed and welcome more trees being planted. School children indicated the green spaces on Gleadless Valley are one of the features they like most about living in Gleadless Valley, but they want to be involved in shaping what further areas are developed for meadow, and what and where play facilities are provided.</p>															
1.8.24	<p>A number of individuals, the organisation Shelter and the two schools visited all called for more play spaces across the whole of Gleadless Valley. It was also commented that play areas should be closer to the housing and that for many in lower Gleadless Valley, Herdings Park was not accessible enough. Two of the three new parks are in lower Gleadless Valley. Parks and Countryside’s strategic approach to play and recreation is to focus on a fewer number of number of recreational locations with a wider range of facilities.</p>															
1.8.25	<p>Table 3 below sets out 10 significant pieces of feedback from Stakeholders relating to the Masterplan with a predominance on green spaces matters. As indicated on page 12 this has been considered by the Gleadless Valley Steering Group and Officers.</p>															
1.8.26	<p>The main conclusion drawn and recommended to Cooperative Executive is that the feedback could be dealt with either post Masterplan approval in the delivery phase or by authorising the Director of Housing to make non material changes to the Masterplan prior to publication of the final Masterplan in June 2022.</p>															
	<p>Table 3</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Gleadless Valley Masterplan Stakeholder Organisation Feedback &amp; Recommendations</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Stakeholder</th> <th>Type of Request</th> <th>Summary of Request</th> <th>Officer Comment</th> <th>Steering Group View</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gleadless Valley Masterplan Stakeholder Organisation Feedback & Recommendations					Stakeholder	Type of Request	Summary of Request	Officer Comment	Steering Group View					
Gleadless Valley Masterplan Stakeholder Organisation Feedback & Recommendations																
Stakeholder	Type of Request	Summary of Request	Officer Comment	Steering Group View												

	GVWT	Removal of a site proposed for new build and site designated as green space.	Site in close proximity to valuable wildlife habitat. Alternatively woodland area needs to be protected by a buffer zone and during construction works	Removal of new build will reduce the net number of homes that would be built. No detailed feasibility has yet been undertaken to establish the viability of the site.  Feasibility, design and planning stages will consider these issues.	Retain site within the plan but aim to include a buffer zone to protect wildlife. Work with GVWT on any new build plans at the appropriate  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN
	GVWT	A request for an ecological map to be produced and funded.	A map showing the areas of land with ecological and green heritage value that is to be protected, retained and managed as naturalistic green space needs to be added to the Plan.	Was due to be delivered by Project Team as part of the masterplan however timeframes and staff capacity prohibited this	Fund and produce an ecological map to be referenced in the Masterplan  Work with stakeholders on the content of this plan.  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN
	GVWT	Alteration to Masterplan boundary in 4 areas	GVWT have provided a drawing for the changes. These are: *To exclude parts of Lees Hall Golf Course currently within the boundary as these areas do not have public access. *To include the whole of key green space sites and potential project areas, detailed list provided includes land with potential for meadow and wetland enhancement and expansion, access improvements and restoration of small orchards, Blackstock Open Space, the 'hub' area at Lees Hall *Potential new orchard project proposed by Regather. * The whole of the valuable Leeshall	The proposed alterations were rejected by members a number of years ago. The changes make some sense as they follow natural landscape boundaries such as change in land use. Sourcing external funding by GVWT may be a benefit if the green space is less divided.  Proposals cross over into other ward boundaries and there has been no consultation with these residents, risk of a legal challenge.	No changes to the masterplan boundary but members wish to reaffirm their commitment to support enhancements to green spaces and habitats in the areas identified by GVWT that will benefit the Masterplan.  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN

			Wood and the Cat Lane and Nether Spring sites		
GVWT	Amendment to housing proposals	Modifications to the Sands Close housing proposal would be desirable to avoid encroachment onto the Local Wildlife Site and could severely restrict the habitat link to Hurlfield Quarry. A possible approach has been provided. The Local Wildlife Site would also have to be protected during the demolition of the existing maisonettes.	The housing proposals are strongly supported by the current residents.  As with all new build schemes there will be an ecological assessment at the planning stage and consideration can then be given to the issue of wildlife impacts, biodiversity and net gain.	No changes to current housing proposals.  Officers will work with GVWT to try to address the issues raised without compromising the overall housing outputs.  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN	
GVWT	Change to green spaces in plan	A valuable area of green spaces forming a green link between the naturalistic green space sites of Nether Spring site and Hurlfield Quarry, and to Gleadless Common, has been omitted and needs to be added to the Plan.	This green space needs to be shown on the plans. It would be picked up as part of the green space/ecological/heritage asset map.	Include as part of ecological map work  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN	

<p>GVWT / PROW / Local Access Forum</p>	<p>Amendments needed to green routes within the Masterplan</p>	<p>The green routes shown in the Masterplan are only indicative some of the routes shown are impractical for general pedestrian access, examples given. GVWT would be happy to advise in the implementation phase of the Plan. For parts of the routes acting as green links little indication is given on what habitats are present and what potential there is for habitat improvements. Hence the reason we have mapped and given information on important habitat green links.</p>	<p>3 organisations have made comments on public rights of way and so potentially high impact.</p> <p>Important as part of the way finding ambitions as well that this is addressed.</p> <p>Recognise also that footpath closure is reference as a possibility in the Masterplan and SCC will need to adhere to statutory legal processes for any footpath closure.</p>	<p>Officers to work with the organisations who have made contact to ensure public rights of way are accurately represented for the Masterplan area</p> <p>SCC will adhere to statutory legal processes for any footpath closure.</p> <p>NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN</p>
<p>GVWT</p>	<p>Greater Emphasis in the Masterplan to a landscape scale naturalistic green space approach</p>	<p><b>Landscape Scale Naturalistic Green Spaces and Green Links 'Project.'</b> The Trust welcomes proposals in the Masterplan to improve green spaces for recreation, play and nature. However, most of the proposals are for small discreet projects and the plan appears to lack an overarching landscape scale approach to green spaces, particularly for the naturalistic green spaces. This needs to be supported by a management plan being produced and support for the existing volunteer network to grow to care for the green resources in Gleadless Valley.</p>	<p>Funding is already allocated from CIL to complete the management plan work.</p> <p>It would help pull together the green space proposals and link strongly with the requested new green space/designation mapping.</p> <p>There is no funding available for volunteer support within the HRA cost envelope for these activities.</p>	<p>Officers will work with GVWT to include a short statement in the Masterplan that places greater emphasis on a landscape approach to green space.</p> <p>Officers to work with GVWT to help identify external funding for volunteer work</p> <p>NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN</p>

1.8.26	GVWT	Amendment to Housing Aims description	Page 6- Vision and Aims: Housing Aims: We feel the character aim need to have stronger protection for naturalistic green spaces etc..., Our suggested amendments is "Ensure that the locations, designs and construction of new housing and adaptions to existing buildings complement and enhance the character of the parkland estate, and protects valuable biodiversity and heritage."	Suggested statement is unclear.  The Masterplan goals include "Preserve and enhance the local character, heritage and wildlife.	No change to the Aim  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN
	GVWT	Significant text change	Concerned at the use of 'underused spaces' in the aims. A green space may have low levels of use by people (e.g., because it's steep) but may have high or potentially high landscape, wildlife and/or heritage value (e.g., has areas of existing wildflower grassland even if presently close mown). For this reason, we think the aim below needs to be for 'underused and low quality spaces', with low quality meaning it has low existing or potential value for landscape, wildlife and/or heritage.	The word underused has different meanings depending on your perspective.  We received feedback from school children are concerned that some areas proposed for meadow are the only flat areas they have to play.  In the Masterplan this primarily refers in the plan to areas between and next to existing housing where infill housing is proposed.  The Masterplan green space aims are intend to enhance the green space quality in these areas.	No change to this term in the document.  Officers to ensure there is wide engagement at the delivery stage.  NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN
	GVWT	Removal of a site proposed for new build.	Raeburn Road – this grass bank supports meadow wildflowers, and we understand is a designated Open Space. It also acts as a green link between part of Herding's	Removal of new build will reduce the net number of homes that would be built. No detailed feasibility has yet been undertaken to establish the viability of the site. Officers have checked this site is owned by Places for People and	Retain site within the plan but establish plans for development by Places for People. NO MATERIAL CHANGE NEEDED TO MASTERPLAN

			Meadows and the meadow areas at Raeburn Place Green Space.	dialogue is needed in what their future plans are.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

## Summary of Green Space Proposals to be included in the Final Masterplan

Proposal	Approach	Details
Public realm	Newfield Green	New public realm area including improved crossing provision and paths and cycle lanes
	Spotswood	Improvements to paths and green space including pocket park with benches
	Blackstock Road	Landscaping, path upgrades and seating areas to improve the look and feel of Blackstock Road
	Spring Close	Improved landscaping and connectivity to Gleadless Road
	Mawfa	Landscaping, traffic calming and new seating area at Mawfa "Village Green"
Play and recreation	Newfield Green	Upgrades to young children's play provision
	Leighton Road	Upgrades to teen play provision
	Spotswood	New play equipment on pocket park
	Hemsworth	Improvements to pitch and new play equipment on open space
Gardens	Infill housing	All new houses to include private gardens
	Maisonettes	Landscaping upgrades and planting in communal gardens
	Remodelling	Ground floor town houses to include private gardens
Natural green space	Woodland Management Plan	Plan to improve quality and use of Wooded areas
	Wildflower/natural areas	Some maintenance regimes to be adapted to support more natural open spaces
	Ecological protection	Green corridors, protection of ecological assets and promotion of biodiversity
	Tree planting	New tree planting will enhance existing neighbourhoods and off set new development
	Locally led projects	Local groups such as GVWT will be supported to continue their green space projects

--	--

<b>1.9</b>	<b>Services and Facilities to be included in the Final Masterplan</b>
------------	---



1.9.1	<p>A sustainable services and facilities offer that promotes equality and boosts health and wellbeing outcomes for local people is important for Gleadless Valley. Over time the sustainability of the three local centres built in the 1950's has varied. The current offer is limited in choice and value and requires travel for healthy food on a budget. It is important that the run-down shopping precincts are not left behind as part of this regeneration and this work will inform the Council's city-wide plans for its district centres.</p>
1.9.2	<p>There is feedback from the community in support of improving all the retail facilities but in particular addressing the Gaunt Local Centre. An option appraisal is currently being commissioned to help identify the most effective way to regenerate the Gaunt Shops site, provide growth and contribute towards affordability and accessibility. This will be completed in the Summer.</p>
1.9.3	<p>Appropriately located community facilities and youth provision were identified by the community as important features of the Masterplan. A number of comments were also made about the need for investment in the Newfield Green Community Centre and this can be considered as part of the community facilities review work already been undertaken in Sheffield City Council. Improving accessible transport links has been a re-occurring theme throughout previous consultation on the Masterplan, and this has emerged again as an issue for local people. Bus providers have been engaged with, but at the time this could not be facilitated. Post the Masterplan being approved affordable provision will be explored with colleagues in Transport to try to secure improvements.</p>
1.9.4	<p>Across all themes feedback was returned that indicated the community in all aspects of their lives were concerned about anti- social behaviour (ASB). This negatively affected some of their feelings about the masterplan proposals, even when improvements were being suggested. The feedback included ASB within and around homes which wasn't tackled by authorities, when accessing green space ASB can be encountered, green spaces are being spoilt by fly tipping and littering and also when attending local retail facilities.</p>
1.9.5	<p>There was also some concern that bringing more people to live of Gleadless Valley may make the situation worse. Whilst homes may have increased security measures overall it was felt this would not address issues of drug taking without support and quad bikes on the estate would damage the improvements. At the member Gleadless Valley Steering Group it was felt that a holistic and agency wide strategy for tackling anti-social behaviour should be an important service priority / output for the final Masterplan.</p>
1.9.6	<p>The following table summarises the plans for service improvements across the valley, these broadly align with the feedback received and none of</p>

these received any negative feedback, indeed respondents wanted to see more specific detail.

Proposal	Area/ approach	Details
Local centres	Newfield Green	Improvements to shop frontages and public realm
	Gaunt and Herdings	Improvement/ regeneration of the local centre
Transport and Highways	Bankwood	Traffic calming and additional parking to improve safety
	Newfield Green	Improvements to crossings and paths including cycle provision
	Blackstock Road	Provision of formal parking spaces
	Constable	Parking improvements
	Various locations	New and remodelled homes to include formal parking
Community facilities	Hemsworth	New high quality community space to be included in the OPIL scheme
	Existing assets	Management of existing facilities will maximise benefits for local people
	Public realm	Investment in the public realm will encourage people to meet outside in safe spaces
Partnership working	Community growing	Sustainable community-led food productive growing projects
	Community gardens	Community led communal and public garden projects
	Community groups and services	Shared spaces and joined up working to boost community development

## 1.10 Employment and Skills to be included in the Final Masterplan

1.10.1 Gleadless Valley has lower than average levels of educational attainment, lower general levels of skills and productivity and, higher than average levels of unemployment and economic inactivity. Within the masterplan there is an aspiration to boost employment and training opportunities and have an employment and skills strategy. The strategy will contain a range of initiatives including maximising training and employment opportunities through the delivery of the physical housing and public realm projects. Increasing the number of homes close to local centres, and improving the local centres is key to increasing footfall and sustaining and attracting local business and employers.

1.10.2 The table below summarises the themes of this aspect of the plan, it is acknowledged that this needs further work but it was encouraging that a number of stakeholders were keen to work with the Council to support this goal aiming to raise the bar on local employment opportunities.

Proposal	Approach	Details
New Employment and Skills Strategy - OS	Gleadless Valley	Pilot for the area
Apprenticeships and Training	Gleadless Valley	Targets for local employment linked to Gleadless Valley investment
Employment and Workspaces	Retail Centres	Creating new opportunities as part of any redevelopment
Nursery Space	Newfield Green	Address childcare gaps, encourage local employers
Community Enterprises	Gleadless Valley	Take forward community commission ideas for food production
Career Fairs / Support Hub for local business	Gleadless Valley	Community based support service e.g., World of Work / support with job applications

## 2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1 The proposed changes in the will improve homes, the local neighbourhood and green spaces on Gleadless Valley.
- 2.2 By delivering the schemes within the masterplan it will contribute to the ambitions to reduce carbon emissions, benefit those in fuel poverty and improve biodiversity.
- 2.3 Through the investment directly on the estate and working with community and voluntary organisations it is hoped that the green space leisure related enhancements, employment opportunities will be created and the acquisition of new skills will be more within reach of residents, helping to support health and wellbeing.

## 3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

- 3.1 Key stages of masterplan development pre-draft publication

The development of the masterplan has been by “co-design” with members, residents and stakeholders working on Gleadless Valley. In summary:

- a. In October 2017 the first consultation exercise began to understand what residents living in and near the valley liked and didn't like about Gleadless Valley.
- b. In June 2018 URBED Ltd were procured and appointed by the Council to assist with this work and commissioned as master planning consultant to provide urban design advice and support for the masterplan.
- c. In 2018 residents and stakeholders were invited to participate in engagement for developing the possible content of the masterplan based on the feedback in 2017. This included questionnaires, speaking directly with the community, 1-2-1 resident meetings, visioning events, design for change workshops and options exhibitions.
- d. In 2018 “Design for Change” workshops, facilitated by URBED and Council officers, gave local people the chance to start developing ideas and designing solutions for their neighbourhood, with the ideas developed and presented at exhibitions.
- e. In 2019 architects and urban designers were procured and commissioned to draw up designs for housing and green space proposals. These commissions and proposals considered: the previous resident engagement feedback; previous building surveys; and housing and estate management feedback relating to anti- social behaviour, hard to let homes and levels of rent arrears. Proposals were then costed, and a financial / high level delivery plan was developed.
- f. During the period 2018 and 2021 there has been specific workstream focus groups with key stakeholders from Council teams including Parks, Countryside and Woodlands, Highways, Property Services, Capital Delivery Service, and key services and stakeholders working in Gleadless Valley, some examples include: the Gleadless Valley Tenants and Residents Association; the Friends of Gleadless Valley; and Gleadless Valley Wildlife Trust. These have invaluable and have particularly shaped the strategies for green and open spaces and employment and skills.

Consultation on Draft Masterplan February – March 2022

3.2 Various methods and levels of communications and consultation were undertaken during the above period:

- a. Online consultation surveys
- b. Social media and .gov emails.
- c. Online videos of Masterplan proposals
- d. Pre-arranged 1-2-1 sessions with residents affected by the replacement housing proposals to gather their views
- e. Six consultation events in community buildings
- f. Consultation materials in community buildings alongside paper surveys
- g. Letters / post cards / posters / banners encouraging participation
- h. Project Team telephone enquiry point
- i. School visits

3.3 Appendix 1 provides the specific detail of the engagement activities undertaken, who participated and the levels of participation for each method used. As indicated in the previous sections on the feedback received, levels of engagement for those most affected was particularly high and there was also high levels of support for the masterplan from this group.

3.4 Whilst the wider Gleadless Valley community did not participate in statistically significant numbers there was support for the masterplan which has taken 4 years to develop. Some residents told us that were sceptical that the plan will be delivered. It is thought therefore that the low response rate was due to an element of engagement fatigue or the delay between initial consultation and consultation on the draft masterplan.

#### 4. Masterplan Cost and Funding

4.1 Feedback on the masterplan and any proposed changes has not highlighted any areas at this stage that would affect the high-level cost and funding plan for Gleadless Valley. Funding of £42m for the existing stock on the Gleadless Valley Masterplan was approved as part of HRA Business Plan report in January 2022.

Type of Scheme	Total Cost	HRA Capital	Other Capital Resources	Borrowing	External Grant	Additional Grant Ask Homes England
Infill	£ 26,898,960			£ 22,179,960	£ 4,719,000	
Housing Renewal	£ 24,990,330	£ 2,097,560	£ 1,081,999	£ 16,910,771		£ 4,900,000
Remodelling	£ 13,696,729	£ 13,133,729	£ 562,999			
Refurbishment	£ 20,413,190	£ 20,413,190				
Public Realm	£ 5,702,775	£ 5,388,881	£ 313,893			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£ 91,701,984</b>	<b>£ 41,033,360</b>	<b>£ 1,958,891</b>	<b>£ 39,090,731</b>	<b>£ 4,719,000</b>	<b>£ 4,900,000</b>

4.2 The Council has a separate agreed Stock Increase Programme (SIP) that will provide 42 local area / local neighbourhoods. The Infill housing above will be at affordable rent levels England funding to ensure the schemes are viable for the Housing Revenue Account. Current funding have been assumed.

4.3 Further funding needs to be identified to support the delivery of local centre improvements and some employment and skills initiatives. The Council does not own most of this provision and has limited resources to directly fund local centres but will enable and support this activity and seek funding from other sources.

4.4 Opportunities for grant funding may help reduce the burden on HRA resources, e.g. green homes grants, but no assumptions for this grant income have been assumed at this stage but the Council will actively support groups working to deliver the ambitions of the masterplan to bid for other funding sources that can be considered.

- 4.5 The feedback from a small number of Owner Occupiers has indicated that financial support may be needed to secure alternative housing. The Council may offer relocation loans such loans cannot be funded from HRA resources but an option is to fund this from land and other capital receipts with the money being repaid.
- 4.6 The funding assumptions above have made allowances for an Gleadless Valley Regeneration delivery team to implement the plans and final proposals.
- 4.7 Members should note that any projects where demolition is approved will impact on rental and council tax income as properties become empty. The HRA Business Plan approved in January 2022 did not make any assumptions for rental income being lost as a result of the proposed demolitions.
- 4.8 Key risks associated with the funding assumptions currently are:
- a. Construction inflation currently is 4.5% and current assumption on the HRA business plan are for 2.5% over the 15-year period of the Masterplan so this is a risk that needs to be monitored carefully.
  - b. Construction inflation may impact on the pipeline of SIP projects that can be avoided
  - c. Detailed site surveys have not been undertaken, costs are based on RIBA stage 1
  - d. Green standards for existing social homes are based on reaching EPC level C, higher levels will increase costs. Current government grant regime is only directed to homes to achieve EPC level C and not higher, this will restrict Sheffield's ability to secure grants.
  - e. Homes England grant regime may change, for example grants may be linked to social rent being charged which would may the schemes not viable.

## **5.0 Summary**

- 5.1 Feedback on the draft Masterplan has received a significant level of positive support from those most affected. There was less feedback from the wider community surveys but this has been supplemented by adhoc feedback and what was received overall was positive. It has indicated respondents would like more investment, the comments received were also consistent in themes across all forms of feedback. This should provide some reassurance that it can be relied upon to inform any decisions. The Masterplan contains much of what the community are looking for and the approval of and subsequent improvements will stimulate the regeneration of this area and deliver the agreed vision for Gleadless Valley.
- 5.2 Constructive feedback has been received from all stakeholders and a real desire to continue to be involved as the programme moves into delivery stage is welcomed. The report indicates where there has been Steering Group engagement on some aspects of the feedback and provides the conclusions from those discussions member. The non-material amendments do not significantly change the Masterplan goals and aspirations but will

strengthen the aspirations to enhance the green spaces and connectivity, and to support biodiversity.

5.3 The report summarises the feedback that has been received and provides a response to the key issues raised. A number of non-material changes to the Masterplan have been identified which can be addressed post approval of the Masterplan under the stewardship of the Director of Housing.

5.4 If approved in summary the final Masterplan will provide:

- a. An additional net increase of 138 homes of high quality that will contribute to reductions in CO2 emissions
- b. Provide greater choice of types and tenure of homes, more homes with secure gardens, more supported housing for older people
- c. Well maintained maisonette blocks with higher thermal performance, secure and upgraded communal areas and modern waste facilities
- d. 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
- e. Additional play facilities for all age groups and better distributed across the valley
- f. Green space and landscape improvements that both provide better connectivity across the valley, provide focal points, private gardens where desired, and community garden areas
- g. A range of initiatives to maximise training and employment opportunities through the delivery of the physical housing and public realm projects
- h. Improve the local centres
- i. Parking improvements and traffic calming in areas residents have identified as a concern

5.5 The report explains the implications for those most affected with regards to rehousing priority being awarded, the need for a local lettings policy to be agreed and the payments to those being displaced from their homes as a result of the Masterplan proposals.

5.6 A number of pieces of work have been identified from the consultation that will support the Masterplan, most notable are an ecology map, whether additional further parking improvements are needed and a strategy for managing anti-social behaviour in the area.

## **6. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

### **6.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications**

6.1.1 A full Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) was completed in 2018 and this has been reviewed and updated taking into consideration the draft Masterplan proposals. A new EIA has been completed taking into account the feedback from the community

- 6.1.2 Overall, the masterplan will have key positive impacts on people who live and work in Gleadless Valley. The proposed Masterplan will provide a plan and a series of improvements that will stimulate the regeneration of this area and deliver the agreed vision for Gleadless Valley.
- 6.1.3 The masterplan will have a cumulative impact as proposals will be delivered over at least 10 years. As more improvements are delivered across the valley, more benefit should be seen for residents living there.
- 6.1.4 The Gleadless Valley Masterplan is intended to positively impact all residents, employees and visitors of the Valley regardless of sex, sexual orientation, faith, race, disability, age, rural isolation and social deprivation. It will promote improved equal access to opportunities throughout the Valley. For example, its aims to increase the access to outdoor sport, leisure and play opportunities as well as access to suitable housing. Full support will be given to residents to relocate and find homes that meet their needs and that of their household, including financial compensation, to mitigate any negative impacts. Individuals who may be more adversely affected by disturbance caused by refurbishment work will be assessed and supported on a case-by-case basis.
- 6.1.5 The Masterplan is inclusive and does not negatively impact on any Protected Characteristic.
- 6.1.6 Profiling information will be used for the area, to ensure that we reach out to any tenants that require extra support, this may include –
- Information in different languages.
  - Interpreters
  - More assistance for people with disabilities, including accessibility during the programme of works.
  - Support for our vulnerable tenants including any with mental health issues.
- 6.1.7 Communication will be on-going to provide people in the area with regular updates on the progression of the Masterplan activities

Issues raised will be addressed through regular monitoring against actions in the EIA. Any policy change or new project that arises following the Masterplan consultation will require an individual EIA.

## 6.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 6.2.1 To date £515,000 of external grant funding from the Estate Regeneration fund has been committed to developing the draft Gleadless Valley Masterplan.
- 6.2.2 Any further work needed to bring forward revisions to the Masterplan prior to approval will be funded from the Housing Investment Plan. .



- 6.2.3 The funding for the investment in existing homes and specific HRA green space projects in the Masterplan is included within the HRA Business Plan that was approved on the 19<sup>th</sup> of January 2022. The new homes in the plan will be funded from the HRA borrowing for the stock increase programme and through grant submissions to Homes England.
- 6.2.4 The costs of the plan and funding will be reviewed on an annual basis due to the impact of construction inflation, this will take place as part of the annual review of the Council's HRA Business Plan.
- 6.2.5 Rent loss will be incurred as a result of the proposals to demolish homes although this will in part be offset by savings on repairs and management costs.

There are no commercial implications at this stage of the Masterplan

### 6.3 Legal Implications

- 6.3.1 The Council has a "General Power of Competence" pursuant to section 1 Localism Act 2011 which gives local authorities the legal capacity to do anything that an individual can do that is not specifically prohibited. This general power gives the Council more freedom to do creative and innovative things to meet local people's needs. The general power of competence does not relieve the Council from any of its specific statutory duties.
- 6.3.2 More specifically in relation to acquiring land and property the Council has a general power under the s120 of the Local Government Act 1972: For the purposes of any of its functions under the Act or any other enactment or to benefit, improve or develop its area, the Council may acquire by agreement any land, whether situated inside or outside their area. The Council may acquire by agreement any land for any purpose which they are authorised by this or any other enactment to acquire land, notwithstanding that the land is not immediately required for that purpose; and, until it is required for the purpose for which it was acquired, any land acquired under this section may be used for the purpose of any of the council's functions.
- 6.3.3 Consequently, the proposals set out in the Masterplan are things that the Council can lawfully undertake. It should be noted that at this stage any third party interests the Council seeks to acquire will be by way of negotiation and not through its CPO powers. Any need to exercise CPO powers will be subject to further report and necessary consents and approvals. However, in doing so the Council must discharge its associated legal duties and comply with the law insofar as the practicalities and execution of the regeneration plan require.
- 6.3.4 The associated duties and powers that the Council must discharge and may exercise in relation to matters arising in this report are specifically:
- A. The public law duty and, regarding its tenants, the tenancy obligation to have regard and consider the responses and outcomes of the consultation in making the decisions required of it in this report. The responses to the consultation are explained, analysed, and appended to this report.
  - B. The statutory duties and discretionary powers to pay compensation, and assist with rehousing, associated with the execution of this Masterplan as follows:

- i. Mandatory Home Loss Compensation Payments pursuant to s.29 Land Compensation Act 1973, as amended by para 3, Sch.15 Housing Act 2004
- ii. Discretionary Home Loss Payments. If an occupier has lived in the property for less than one year but has a legal interest and occupies the property as their only or main residence at the date of displacement, they may be entitled to a discretionary payment, not exceeding the amount of the mandatory payment. S.29(2) Land Compensation Act 1973
- iii. Mandatory Disturbance Payments. To compensate a residential occupier for reasonable expenses in moving from the house or land. Section 37 Land Compensation Act 1973. (Note even if there is no entitlement, local authorities have discretion to make a payment by way of compensation for disturbance).
- iv. Duty to rehouse displaced occupiers. S.39 (1) Land Compensation Act 1973. The local authority only has a rehousing duty if 'suitable alternative residential accommodation' on reasonable terms is not available to the displaced person. The duty on the local authority to rehouse the displaced person is separate from an authority's homelessness duties under the Housing Act 1996. There is no requirement that the person be in priority need.

## **7. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

*(Outline any alternative options which were considered but rejected in the course of developing the proposal.)*

### **7.1** *The alternative options that have been rejected are:*

#### *1. Delaying a decision on the adoption of a Masterplan*

*There would be 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. The feedback from residents clearly indicates they are concerned about the condition of their homes. There is a high level of support from the residents directly affected and although low survey returns for the overall plan the feedback is overall in support of the improvements that are proposed.*

#### *2. Abandon any plans to implement 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 did not move into delivery stage as an overarching plan the council would still need to commit significant investment and deliver elements of extensive repairs to ensure homes were maintained in line with stock condition surveys. There would be a risk that the homes in need of most interventions would become even less sustainable and this could have a negative impact on the estate, rental income would be lost and reactive repair costs would rise.*

## 8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 The Council embarked on the masterplan work in 2017 following a grant bid 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. The proposals for the masterplan were co-produced with members and community.
- 8.2 An engagement plan was developed, and all residents and stakeholders have had the opportunity to provide feedback. Feedback has now been collated following a 6-week consultation process, this indicates support overall for the proposals.
- 8.3 Members of the Gleadless Valley Steering Group have reflected on the feedback and have proposed ( Table 3) the plan is refined in a few small areas, but these do not change the overall goals, principles, vision or financial plan for the masterplan
- 8.4 The outcomes that are now sought are:
- Members to carefully consider and have regard to the consultation feedback in making its decisions arising from this report
  - Members to endorse moving forward and to approve the Masterplan
  - Members to approve and authorise that officers should make nonmaterial changes to the masterplan in response to some of the feedback received through consultation, and that the final plan be published in June 2022
  - Delegations to be given to the Director of Housing and the Head of Regeneration and Property to enable the masterplan to be delivered
  - Officers to commence work to develop a delivery plan to enable the work described in the report to be implemented

### Appendix 1 Engagement Summary

Target audience	Who?	How did we reach them?	Response
Elected members, Inc.	Corporative Exe Members and local Ward Councillors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly meeting, emails, briefing notes</li> </ul>	Steering Group engaged in meetings

Steering Group			
Engagement Forum	plus, three representatives from the Gleadless Valley TARA and Reverend Middleton, from the Holy Cross Church.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly meeting, emails, briefing notes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement Forum engaged in meetings Meeting</li> </ul>
Stakeholder groups and organisations	<p>See table above &amp;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heeley Trust</li> <li>Heeley City Farm</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Foodbank</li> <li>Newfield Green Library</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Methodist Church</li> <li>SAVTE</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Wildlife Trust</li> <li>GV Litter picking group</li> <li>Friends of the Valley</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Email updates</li> <li>Consultation events</li> <li>Attendance at existing stakeholder meetings such as the Gleadless Valley Partnership.</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Masterplan Briefing meeting 21/01/22</li> <li>Discussions with schools in the area, masterplan consultation sessions carried out 2/3/22 &amp; 3/3/22</li> <li>Paper copy of masterplan and surveys delivered to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bankwood Community Primary school,</li> <li>Co-op on Constable Road,</li> <li>Gaunt Road shops – Deli Hut,</li> <li>Gaunt Road shops,</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Holy Cross Church,</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Medical Centre,</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Methodist Church,</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Pharmacy,</li> <li>Heeley City Farm</li> <li>Herdings Centre,</li> <li>Herdings shops off Moorland Road,</li> <li>Herdings shops off Moorland Road - “Local” shop,</li> <li>Newfield Green shops,</li> <li>Newfield secondary school,</li> <li>The Blackstock Pub,</li> <li>The Premier shop,</li> <li>Woodlands Primary School,</li> <li>William Fairhead – Gleadless Valley Wildlife Trust,</li> <li>Irene – resident of Gaunt Road, litter picker and volunteer</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South Yorkshire Climate Alliance</li> <li>Gleadless Valley Wildlife Trust</li> <li>Responses from school sessions</li> <li>Sheffield Local Access Forum Peak and Northern Footpath Society</li> <li>Heeley City Farm</li> <li>Foodbank</li> <li>Shelter</li> </ul>

Internal Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Head of Housing Investment and Maintenance</li> <li>• Strategic Housing and Regeneration</li> <li>• South &amp; Southwest Housing Team</li> <li>• Housing officers</li> <li>• South Sheffield Local Area Partnership</li> <li>• LACs Forward &amp; Area Planning</li> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Housing Growth Team</li> <li>• Asset Management</li> <li>• Homes &amp; Loans</li> <li>• Leaseholder Team</li> <li>• Communications Service</li> <li>• Parks Countryside &amp; Woodlands</li> <li>• Business Growth</li> <li>• Libraries &amp; Community Services</li> <li>• First point</li> <li>• Contact Centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplan briefing email.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCC Ecology/ Woodlands</li> <li>• Public rights of Way</li> <li>• SCC - Natural Flood and Water Management</li> </ul>
Local residents (4,680 households within the Gleadless Valley Area)	<a href="#">Ward Profile</a> MOSAIC data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postcards</li> <li>• Posters displayed around the estate</li> <li>• Consultation events (including an event with local interpreter)</li> <li>• Social media, including paid-for posts</li> <li>• Local press/radio</li> <li>• Gov delivery emails / e-bulletin</li> <li>• Online – through the SCC website and any other local relevant websites</li> <li>• Word of mouth via local organisations/ stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94 responses via questionnaire</li> <li>• 148 attended consultation events mixture of council tenants, homeowners, people who work in the valley</li> <li>• 34,424 total views of all social media posts</li> <li>• 1,206 clicks on links to webpage</li> <li>• 2,578 shares, likes and comments on social media posts</li> <li>• Geo targeting and paid ads on Facebook enabled wider reach as well as using the #Sheffield</li> <li>• Top performing post Children have spoken post</li> </ul>

<p>Residents /landlords directly Impacted</p>	<p>Tenants, leaseholders, landlords and private tenants all impacted directly by housing proposals - remodelling/demolition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter sent to all affected households/ landlords on 3<sup>rd</sup> Jan to inform them of proposals and to offer them a face-to-face interview with SCC officers during consultation period.</li> <li>• SCC Tenants - Door knocked a minimum of 3 times, where not answered a calling card was posted through letter box, followed with x2 calls, voicemails and emails where applicable</li> <li>• Private tenants – unknown risk data, or contact data so contact through letter drop x2</li> <li>• Landlords – letter x2, emailed and called where possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 65% SCC Residents</li> <li>• 20% Private Tenants</li> <li>• 100% Homeowner (owner-occupier)</li> <li>• 50% Leaseholder Landlord</li> </ul>
<p>Local business owners</p>	<p>Local business owners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advertised on social media, and hard copies of plans delivered to front facing businesses/shopping centres</li> </ul>	




This page is intentionally left blank



# Gleadless Valley Resident Consultation Results

Cooperative Executive Report March 2022

Overall, 80% of all respondents support the proposals for the areas of Gleadless Valley they live in. 7% of respondents are neutral and 12% oppose the proposals.



■ Support ■ Neutral ■ Do not support


Across the 4 tenure types,

**123** support the proposals, **11** are neutral, and **19** do not support the proposals.

# COUNCIL TENANT RESPONSES.

Responses as of 04/03/2022

# Number of Responses





141

Respondents

We have had 141 responses out of 217 council tenants we reached out to. This is a response rate of 65%.

# Are you aware the Council has been developing a masterplan for your area?




58% of current respondents were aware of the Gleadless Valley masterplan, however this awareness ranged drastically between the different areas of Gleadless Valley. Plowright residents have been the most aware of the masterplan.

Over half of respondents in Herding's were unaware of the masterplan. This area is characterised by 1-bedroom flats.

Comments on this question go into detail about when and how tenants learnt about the plan, or about the extent they are aware of the plan.

# What other rehousing options is the tenant interested in?




Theme	Count	%
Wants to remain in a Council House or Housing Association.	101	72%
Would consider other housing options but has a preference for Council House or Housing Association	6	4%
No clear preference in comment box	11	8%
No comment	23	16%
<b>Total wanting to remain in a Council Property</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>76%</b>

At least 76% of respondents mentioned that they'd prefer to remain in a Council tenancy if they were rehoused. 4% of total respondents said they would consider other rehousing options however their preference is Council tenancies.


Several people also mentioned their intentions of using RTB to purchase their Council property in the future.

8% of respondents didn't have a clear preference for rehousing option provided in the comment field.

# Would the tenant want to remain in Gleadless Valley or move elsewhere?



Page 47



47% of respondents want to remain in the valley, however this differs greatly between areas. 29% of respondents want to move out of the valley. 24% of respondents would consider remaining or moving elsewhere.

Comments on this question go into detail on why residents would want to remain in the valley or leave.

Schools, communities, friends and family are all considerations for why some respondents want to remain in the valley.

Of the 47% of tenant respondents who said they'd want to remain within Gleadless Valley, the key themes include:

Reason for wanting to remain in Gleadless Valley	Number of comments which contained this theme (SCC Tenants)
Remain close to family and friends	15
Remain close to schools	14
Have lived in Gleadless Valley for a long-time	8
Familiar with the area	4
Would like to remain in a specific area of Gleadless Valley	4
Gleadless Valley has good/convenient transport links	3
Remain due to community	2
Loves the area	2
Works in the Valley	2
Enjoys the local walks and woodlands	1
Would like to remain in Gleadless Valley depending on circumstances when requiring to be rehoused	1
Gleadless Valley has shops and services	1
Feels secure	1
Comment has no clear theme relevant to WHY someone wants to stay in the Valley	8

Please note that some responses are more detailed than others. Not every response has a comment detailing their reasoning. If multiple themes appear in a single comment I have broken them out in this tally.





29% of current SCC tenants would want to leave Gleadless Valley. These are the most frequent reasons for wanting to leave the valley:

Reason for wanting to relocate outside Gleadless Valley	Number of comments which contained this theme (SCC Tenants)
Would like to move to specific area of Sheffield	9
Move closer to family	9
Move towards schools	5
Would like to move out of Gleadless Valley due to concerns around ASB, drugs or crime	4
Would only like to remain in Gleadless Valley depending on rehousing provided	3
Move closer to place of work	2
Doesn't like living in Gleadless Valley	2
Concerned the area won't improve after the masterplan due to ASB	1
Closer to city centre	1
Move somewhere flatter for accessibility	1
Closer to hospital	1
Would like to move due to disrepair	1
Move out of Gleadless for mental health	1
Move out of Sheffield	1
Comment has no clear theme relevant to WHY someone doesn't want to stay in the Valley	4

Please note that some responses are more detailed than others – if multiple themes appear in a single comment I have broken them out in this tally.

# How does the tenant feel about the proposals for their respective areas?



84% of all Council Tenant responses so far have been in support of the proposals.

Residents in Herding's have shown the least support for the proposed plans in their area of the Gleadless Valley, with 18% of respondents not supporting the proposals.

84% of tenant respondents currently support the plans for masterplan.

Reason for supporting proposal	Number of comments which contained this theme (SCC Tenants)
Properties are old and/or in disrepair	15
Would benefit/improve the area (such as in appearance)	14
Proposals may improve ASB, crime and drug use in the neighbourhood	8
Modernising the Valley	5
Wants to live in a house and/or area they can be proud off	2
Good for the community	1
Properties would have private gardens	2
Supports as has opportunity to stay in the valley afterwards	1
Council will help with rehousing	1
Would improve the valley for residents in local care home	1
New houses will encourage residents to remain in the valley longer	1
Comment doesn't detail WHY they support proposals	27

Please note that some responses are more detailed than others – if multiple themes appear in a single comment I have broken them out in this tally.

10 % of tenant respondents don't support the plans.

Page 52

Reason for not supporting proposal	Number of comments which contained this theme (SCC Tenants)
Wants to remain in current property	8
Concerns around the bidding process of getting a new property	2
Concerned "bad" tenants would be put into the new builds	1
Concerns around the financial aspect of rehousing	1
Plans are too tall for the area	1
Concerned they will be forced to downsize (i.e. going from a 3-bed to a 1-bed)	1
Wants the masterplan only to improve the external image of the valley	1
Comment doesn't detail WHY they don't support proposals	0


Some tenants mentioned that they'd support the plans if they didn't have to move from their current property. Reasons for not wanting to move from current property include age, stress, memories and hassle.

Please note that some responses are more detailed than others – if multiple themes appear in a single comment I have broken them out in this tally.

# OWNER OCCUPIER RESPONSES.


Responses as of 04/03/2022

**Are you aware the Council has been developing a masterplan for your area?**



100% of owner-occupier interviews have been conducted. Most were aware of the masterplan.

# What other rehousing options is the owner-occupier interested in?




80% of owner-occupiers interviewed are interested in becoming council tenants as a rehousing option. However in some instances, this was to enable them to RTB or utilise their 2<sup>nd</sup> RTB if the proposals went ahead, rather than choosing a council tenancy as the preferred tenure

There are owner-occupier concerns around being forced to downsize, or being unable to afford another mortgage due to getting the property originally on RTB/ or other external factors affecting them securing a mortgage.

Note – someone can select multiple different rehousing options.


# Would the owner-occupier want to remain in Gleadless Valley or move elsewhere?



Schools, work and family were key reasons for why many owner-occupiers would prefer to remain in the Valley. Though some residents mentioned that they'd want to remain within proximity of Gleadless Valley – so adjoining neighbourhoods may still be in consideration.



## How does the owner-occupier feel about the proposals for their respective areas?



3 of the 5 owner-occupiers don't support the proposals.


Some residents are concerned about the cost of moving, and the uncertainty on whether they'd be able to secure another mortgage (either due to getting the property on RTB or other external factors affecting them getting a mortgage). Also that they had invested significantly in their current property and to improve it to their liking.

Suggestions that the money should be spent externally improving the housing, rather than remodelling or replacing

# PRIVATE TENANT RESPONSES.


Responses as of 04/03/2022

## Are you aware the Council has been developing a masterplan for your area?



Only 2 private tenant interviews have been conducted. This is out of 10 private tenants written to, giving us a 20% response rate.

# Would the private tenant want to remain in Gleadless Valley or move elsewhere?




2 (100%)

● Move elsewhere ● Remain in Gleadless Valley ● Either

Both tenants interviewed would prefer to remain in Gleadless Valley.

# How does the tenant feel about the proposals for their respective areas?



2 (100%)


● Support

Both private tenants supported the proposals

# LANDLORD RESPONSES.

Responses as of 04/03/2022


## Are you aware the Council has been developing a masterplan for your area?



● No - Unaware of masterplan ● Not Answered ● Yes - Aware of masterplan

Of the 5 landlord leaseholders interviewed, most were unaware of the masterplan. We wrote to 10 leaseholder landlords, with our response rate being 50%.

# How does the leaseholder landlord feel about the proposals for their respective areas?




Only 1 leaseholder landlord supports the proposals, with 2 being neutral and 2 not supporting.




# Equalities Breakdown


## Sex of Respondents



## Ethnicity of Respondents



Does the respondent have a disability?



■ No ■ Not Answered ■ Yes

# Gleadless Valley Wider Consultation Results

Cooperative Executive Report March 2022

# Housing Proposals

## Top themes respondents like about the proposals

Themes	Count
Improving the external image/presentation of housing	11
Improving the standard/quality of housing	6
Approves of private garden spaces being added	6
Makes the area more modernised	6
Proposals will make residents feel safer	4

Page 68

## Top themes respondents dislike about the proposals

Themes	Count
We need additional parking alongside new properties or improvements should be made to areas that can facilitate parking.	9
Some views may be obscured by proposed buildings	6
Proposals don't tackle ASB / ASB could undo progress / ASB may increase due to more residents / ASB will still make residents feel negative	6
Living conditions in current stock should be improved first	5
Uncertainty of relocation/rehousing	4

# Other comments

Summarised comment	Count
Believes Council should improve properties people don't want to live in, such as Callow High Rise Flats, instead of building new builds.	2
We need better infrastructure	1
We need a better shopping district	1
Parking considerations need to be made alongside proposed schemes	1
Overgrown hedges are an issue in the valley and can make some walkways impassable	1
There are issues around littering and fly tipping in the valley which need to be addressed	1
Wants more 4 bedroom properties built near Bankwood Close.	1
Concerns that not all the plans will happen due to the cost	1
Concerns around property allocation – i.e. couples only getting 1 bedroom properties	1
Concerns on if the proposals actually go ahead	1
Parking congestion can reduce visibility and safety for children playing	1
Green space should come first	1
Properties need to be looked after and maintained into the long-term	1
Proposal doesn't go far enough.	1
Council needs to focus on cleaning the area (i.e. rubbish)	1
Maisonettes and flats need demolishing	1
The whole community needs to be considered including older generations	1
Area may become cramped with additional housing	1

# General opinion of the housing proposals

Themes	Count
Respondent likes proposals	16
Respondent likes proposals but is sceptical they will happen	4
Respondent likes parts of the proposals, but has also has dislikes/concerns	23
Respondent likes proposals but has suggestions	14
Respondent likes proposals but wants more details on how they'll be affected	1
Respondent doesn't like proposals	9
Respondent hasn't left a comment on this section	12
Respondent has left a suggestion, but not enough information to determine overall opinion	8
Not enough information to determine whether someone likes or doesn't like proposal	7

The housing proposal section has the highest response rate of public consultation.

It is also the most divisive.

Many respondents like the proposals put forward (or at least part of the proposals), but have issues and concerns.

Some of the key concerns identified in people's responses are around a lack of parking, views being obstructed by the proposed housing and ASB continuing in the Valley despite the proposals.

It is worth noting that the level of detail in responses varies, with some responses providing criticism and suggestions, while other comments go into less detail or don't provide obvious opinion.

This tally is based on interpretation of a respondents written comments across three questions.

# Shared and Green Space Proposals

## Top themes respondents like about the proposals

Themes	Count
Wildflower planting and adding more trees	7
Improving walking routes and footpaths	5
Will improve the image of the valley	5
Improving local wildlife	4
Increased parking (at Bankwood Road)	4

Page 71

## Top themes respondents dislike about the proposals

Themes	Count
Concerns around ASB, crime and vandalism (includes comments on dirt/quad bikes on green spaces)	10
Concerns over long time maintenance	10
Doesn't support under used open spaces being used to build new homes	4
Plans are too green – not enough flowers	2
No clear walking routes or cycle paths	2

# Other comments

Summarised comment	Count
Comments made about ongoing maintenance	6
Concerns ASB, drinking, littering, fly-tipping or quad/dirt bikes will ruin the developments. Or that improving outdoor spaces will further incentivise this behaviour.	4
Footpaths need to be well lit	1
Concerns that some residents may ruin these developments	1
Additional parking needs to be created	1
More properties need private gardens	1
More green spaces needed around Gaunt Road	1
Tenants should be made to keep area maintained	1
Unnecessary expenditure	1
The valley needs more children play areas	1
CCTV needs to be placed throughout the valley	1
New footpaths must be installed to prevent vehicles from driving on grass or planted areas	1



# General opinion of the green and shared proposals

Themes	Count
Respondent likes proposals	24
Respondent likes proposals but is sceptical they will happen	0
Respondent likes parts of the proposals, but has also has dislikes/concerns	24
Respondent likes proposals but has suggestions	7
Respondent doesn't like proposals	2
Respondent hasn't left a comment on this section	21
Respondent has left a suggestion, but not enough information to determine overall opinion	8
Not enough information to determine whether someone likes or doesn't like proposal	8

The majority of respondents have liked the green and shared space proposals (or at least elements of them).

Many respondents did cite concerns or suggestions (which can be seen better on previous slides).

The key issues throughout this section are:

**ASB** – Concerns some of the green and shared space proposals could be ruined by individuals.

**Maintenance** – how will these spaces been looked after in the long-term?

**Losing green space to new housing** – not in support of using underused green space for new housing

# Services and Facilities Proposals

## Top themes respondents like about the proposals

Themes	Count
More activities for young people	6
Approves of Gaunt Road shops being improved	4
Supports plans for older persons' scheme	2

Page 74

## Top themes respondents dislike about the proposals

Themes	Count
Concerns that until ASB is addressed there will be no real change	3
Not enough detail about youth clubs	3
Doesn't believe the plans will actually happen	2
Bus routes must be improved / Accessibility	2

# Other comments

Summarised comment	Count
Hopes Gaunt area gets a supermarket.	1
Hopes Blackstock Road and Herdings are connected via bus route	1
Newfield Green shopping area has regular ASB	1
Concerns that plans won't eradicate ASB	1
Would like to see more solutions for older people as well as younger people	1
Concerns that Herding's shops will look out-dated next to the proposed new housing	1
We need to incentivise companies to consider Gleadless Valley for shops and investment	1
Plans require more detail	1
Would like to see John O'Gaunt made into a community pub	1
Accessible transport links are important so residents can access opportunities	1
Plans need more activities/facilities for children – suggestion for using the quarry space	1
Services and facilities are the key to Gleadless Valley feeling like a good place to live	1
There need to be more services and facilities for the young people	1
Would like to see better disabled access at shops	1
More parking required	1

# General opinion of the services and facilities proposals

Themes	Count
Respondent likes proposals	15
Respondent likes proposals but is sceptical they will happen	2
Respondent likes parts of the proposals, but has also has dislikes/concerns	4
Respondent likes proposals but has suggestions	7
Respondent doesn't like proposals	4
Respondent hasn't left a comment on this section	35
Respondent has left a suggestion, but not enough information to determine overall opinion	13
Not enough information to determine whether someone likes or doesn't like proposal	14

Survey engagement is more lacking for this section, with many respondents not providing any feedback. There are also 27 comments where comments provided aren't in enough detail to determine if they like or dislike the proposals.

People are concerned that until ASB is addressed there will be no real change, particularly around the shopping centres.

Respondents are also wanting more detail on the possibility of youth clubs in the valley. Improved bus routes / accessibility to services was also noted as something people wanted to see.

# Employment and Skills Proposals

## Top themes respondents like about the proposals

Themes	Count
Will help to reduce unemployment and improve skills	9
Working with community led organisations	3
Apprenticeships	2
Clearer pathway for young people from school to work	1
Tackling a root issue in Gleadless Valley	1

Page 77

## Top themes respondents dislike about the proposals

Themes	Count
Employment won't improve until drug issues are resolved	2
Uncertain proposals will actually happen	2
Doesn't see many jobs being created	1
There needs to support for young parents in life skills	1
Not enough activities for those who can't work (i.e. disabled, retired, carers)	1
Different households need different support (i.e. disabilities, troubled families, asylum seekers)	1

# Other comments

Summarised comment	Count	Cell
Transportation is holding many people back (i.e. unreliable bus services)	1	P2
More details required	1	P3
Current plans are too vague	1	P40
Would like to see adult learning centres return – currently they're online	1	P48
There needs to be liaison with local secondary schools	1	P79

# General opinion of the employment and skills proposals

Themes	Count
Respondent likes proposals	19
Respondent likes proposals but is sceptical they will happen	1
Respondent likes parts of the proposals, but has also has dislikes/concerns	3
Respondent likes proposals but has suggestions	1
Respondent doesn't like proposals	2
Respondent hasn't left a comment on this section	55
Respondent has left a suggestion, but not enough information to determine overall opinion	5
Not enough information to determine whether someone likes or doesn't like proposal	8


Over half of survey respondents didn't comment on the employment and skills section.

Of those that did, most comments were positive – with respondents citing that unemployment is a serious issue in the Valley.


There were a couple of respondents concerned that taking and/or dealing drugs will impact people's willingness to seek employment opportunities.

Some respondents are uncertain these proposals will be delivered.

# Equalities Breakdown 1






- Female
- Male
- Not Answered
- Other (please state below)



- English/Welsh/Scottish/British/Northern Irish
- Other White background (please state below)
- Asian/Asian British
- Black/Black British
- Mixed/Multiple Heritage
- Not provided




# Equalities Breakdown 2



Does the Respondent have a disability

# What is the Respondents connection to Gleadless Valley



- I live in Gleadless Valley
- I live and work in Gleadless Valley
- I care for someone who lives in Gleadless Valley
- I visit friend/relative who lives in Gleadless Valley
- I work in Gleadless Valley
- Other
- Not Answered

**Comments which give specific suggestions or concerns regarding a specific area of Gleadless Valley.**

Housing	Count
We need to improve Callow high rise flats	3
Housing at the top of Gaunt Road may obstruct views	2
Housing on Callow Road would overlook into existing housing	2
Houses on Overend Road would look out of place – instead suggests demolishing the bottom 3 blocks for development.	1
Raeburn Road site is unnecessary due to flats on Morland road already being remodelled. Proposals might reduce green space in the area.	1
It is a shame there are no proposals for Bankwood Close (mentions needing a 4 bedroom and wanting to remain in the area)	1
Comment on maintenance issues for houses on Raeburn Road (roofs renewed, trees causing gutters to block)	1
There are a lot of 3 story houses on Blackstock Road which would benefit from being provided private gardens.	1
We should remove or remodel the existing two blocks in Ironside / Blackstock	1
Unsure on proposed new builds on Blackstock, Abney and Callow	1
The Callow site has underground springs which might impact feasibility of the site	1
Earlier stages of the consultation mentioned exploring the old Hemsworth School site for housing. Would like more details on how earlier site allocations were considered	1
Housing proposed on Gleadless Road will affect view, take away children's play areas, and impact parking	1
Housing on Gaunt Road may create a wind tunnel effect	1
Would like more information on Gaunt Road and Hemsworth development	1
Concerned Spring Close Ranch flats will lose distinctiveness by replacing wooden planters on the deck walkways	1
Does not support proposed Overend site as it would create more parking/traffic problems	1
Plan is unclear for Overend area	1
Houses which aren't included in proposals in Middle Hay View, Fleury Place, Fleury Crescent will still looked tattered and worn down.	1
The green space at the side of Buckwood Gleadless Road isn't suitable for buildings as it'll reduce green space. It'll also impact traffic.	1

Shared and Green Spaces	Count
There are areas in Rolleston Woods which can be dangerous to dogs & children due to burnt rubbish and smashed glass	1
Herdings needs deterrents (such as barriers) preventing people driving on green spaces between blocks	1
Not enough developments in Lower Gleadless Valley – proposals must be spread out	1
Not enough green spaces or children play areas around Gaunt Road	1
Would like to see more paths in Herdings park to encourage people to walk around it.	1
Children play areas need to be local to housing as won't be utilised if not close to residents property – suggestions for Rollstone and Hemsworth.	2
Second comment supports this, saying Herdings is too far for children's play areas	
The proposals at Leighton Road aren't suitable due to it being a grassed bank. It is also on the wrong side of the road.	1

Facilities	Count
The Terry Wright Centre could be better utilised as a community resource	2
The proposals should include removing the dump site – turning the dump site into a wildlife hub modelled on Ecclesall Woods Sawmill area	1
Concerns that playing fields in Hemsworth will create noise – need proper fencing on the wood edge near Hemsworth	1
Would like to see John O'Gaunt made into a community pub, which was a plan prior to the Council purchasing it.	1
The old quarry space on Gleadless Road could be used to make more green spaces for children	1

Shopping	Count
Supermarket at Gaunt	1
Newfield Green shops feel unsafe and have high levels of ASB	2
Plans do not mention the shops at Herdings	1
Herdin shops also need investment in order to compliment appearance of new houses.	1
Springs area would benefit from a convenience store as closest shops are down a steep hill.	1
Concerns the remodelling of Herdings will impact customer flow in local shops.	1
Gaunt shops needs a lot of work doing (comment does not go into more detail)	1
Shops at Gaunt/Blackstock and Newfield need improving	1
Quadbikes are driven around the Gaunt Road shops, and even on the steps	1
Most shops at Newfield Green don't have wheelchair access	1

Public Transport	Count
First removed service from Blackstock Road, making it difficult to cross the Valley	1

Roads	Count
Spotswood Road could benefit with speed bumps due to people ignoring the speed limit. Parked cars on either side of the road also obscure vision for drivers.	1
Spotswood, Overend and Gaunt roads are becoming dangerous	1
Constable Road could benefit from being made into a one-way system due to dangerous bends. There have been past accidents on the road.	1
Constable Road should have speed bumps	1
Traffic calming measures should be installed on Blackstock Road near Overend Road. There have been accidents on the bend over the past 5 years.	1
One way system out of Overend past the pub onto Blackstock Road	1

Parking	Count
Bankwood school needs barriers to prevent cars parking on the pavement. Other schools in Sheffield have better drop-off points	1
Poor parking on Raeburn Road. Suggestion for a hard standing on the grass verge similar to on Eastbank Road	1
Improving parking on Constable Road will help the flow of traffic	1
Converting garages on Plowright might impact parking on the estate	1
Not enough parking for existing residents in Overend. When the original houses were built they had communal gardens which fell into disrepair leaving residents without adequate parking. Suggests we provide extra parking.	1
Not enough parking around Gaunt Road	1
Doesn't like option 2 for Bankwood Road as it could lead to cars turning around at school time	1

## Question / Comments / Information Received Outside of Formal Consultations

### Discussions around parking

- Concerns on how new developments across the valley may impact parking
- Better parking around the valley to stop people driving on grassed areas
- Plowright Way parking needs improving, there are concerns the proposed development will worsen the situation
- Support for extra parking at Bankwood, consideration needed for electrical charging facilities
- Parking around Gaunt needs to be addressed, particularly around the shops
- Gaunt road garages could be used for extra parking

Concerns over property being affected (property not in current proposals)

- Spring View Close
- Plowright Way

Increasing the number of community centres/utilising existing facilities for community purposes

Request for more information on current proposals

Comment on lack of play facilities in the area.

- Play facilities at Gaunt
- Concerns infill sites will take away play areas

Interested in / concerned about the protection of wildlife and habitat – and how risks can be mitigated during construction

Questions on how to secure a property and get on the waiting list

Time-capsule buried by students of old school which we should keep an eye on during work

Concerns new housing will reduce green space and trees in the area

Request for future maps to have roads more clearly labelled

Request for each proposed properties footprint (in square metres) to be provided as well as detail as to their location

Consider making Ironside Road into a one-way system

Comment on drugs in Gleadless Valley being a reason people don't want to move to the Valley.

Comment from SCC Natural Flood and Water Management Coordinator on incorporating SUDS design in early stages.

Feedback on sections of the masterplan

Would house value increase in value due to refurbishments?

Question: Would another garage be provided if their garage is removed

Concerns about quality of products and work standards during refurbishment

Questions on compensation for leaving property

Question from leaseholder landlord: What compensation should my tenants get?

Has consideration been given to electric car charging facilities



## Discussions around parking

- Concerns on how new developments across the valley may impact parking
- Better parking around the valley to stop people driving on grassed areas
- Plowright Way parking needs improving, there are concerns the proposed development will worsen the situation
- Support for extra parking at Bankwood, consideration needed for electrical charging facilities
- Parking around Gaunt needs to be addressed, particularly around the shops
- Gaunt road garages could be used for extra parking

Concerns over property being affected (property not in current proposals)

- Spring View Close
- Plowright Way

Increasing the number of community centres/utilising existing facilities for community purposes

Request for more information on current proposals

Comment on lack of play facilities in the area.

- Play facilities at Gaunt
- Concerns infill sites will take away play areas

Interested in / concerned about the protection of wildlife and habitat – and how risks can be mitigated during construction

Questions on how to secure a property and get on the waiting list

Time-capsule buried by students of old school which we should keep an eye on during work

Concerns new housing will reduce green space and trees in the area

Request for future maps to have roads more clearly labelled

Request for each proposed properties footprint (in square metres) to be provided as well as detail as to their location

Consider making Ironside Road into a one-way system

Comment on drugs in Gleadless Valley being a reason people don't want to move to the Valley.

Comment from SCC Natural Flood and Water Management Coordinator on incorporating SUDS design in early stages.

Feedback on sections of the masterplan

Would house value increase in value due to refurbishments?

Question: Would another garage be provided if their garage is removed

Concerns about quality of products and work standards during refurbishment

Questions on compensation for leaving property

Question from leaseholder landlord: What compensation should my tenants get?

Has consideration been given to electric car charging facilities

This page is intentionally left blank