

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 31 October 2012 by the Cabinet.

Date notified to all members: 2nd November, 2012.

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on 8th November, 2012.

The decision can be implemented from 9th November, 2012.

Item No

8. JOINT HEALTH AND WELL BEING STRATEGY

- 8.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report referring to the fact that the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board, comprising representatives from Sheffield's Clinical Commissioning Group, the Council and representatives from LINK/Healthwatch, in order to agree shared priorities to improve the health and wellbeing of Sheffield people, would assume statutory status in April 2013.

The report, therefore, sought approval of the Cabinet to the Joint Health and Well Being Strategy, which was formed from the evidence gathered under the Joint StrategicNeeds Assessment and was the responsibility of the Board.

- 8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy;
- (b) commits to supporting the further development of the Strategy by the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board; and
- (c) commits to aligning the Council's commissioning plans according to the Strategy.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

Cabinet is asked to approve the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy so that the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board is able to continue to work to better the health and wellbeing of the people of Sheffield and use the strategy to assess its priorities.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy is a statutory responsibility of the shadow Health and Wellbeing Board, and therefore must be produced.

8.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

8.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

8.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Richard Webb, Executive Director, Communities

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care

9. SHEFFIELD LOWER DON VALLEY FLOOD DEFENCE PROJECT

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on the work which had been undertaken by the City Council, Environment Agency (EA) and local businesses to deliver a flood defence scheme in the Lower Don Valley (LDV) to protect the public infrastructure and vital manufacturing and engineering industry from the damage suffered through the floods in 2000 and 2007. Applications had been made for public sector funding through the European Regional Development Fund and the EA for 75% of the total cost of the project. Additionally, a Business Improvement District (BID) was proposed as the mechanism to secure contributions from private sector beneficiaries of the Scheme

The report, therefore, sought authority for officers to pursue the various financial elements of public and private sector contributions and cashflow options arranged by the Council.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet agrees that the Director of Development Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance, Director of Legal Services and Cabinet Members for Environment, Waste and Streetscene and Business, Skills and Development, be authorised to:-

- (a) negotiate, agree and complete the terms of funding contracts with external grant organisations including (but not limited to) the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and the Environment Agency (EA);
- (b) negotiate and agree the terms of a Business Improvement District (BID) for the Lower Don Valley Flood Defence Scheme and implement a ballot process;
- (c) explore finance options enabling the Council to cash flow the

private sector contribution towards the construction phase of the project subject to businesses agreeing to the establishment of a Business Improvement District through which the Council's contribution would be recovered, including the possibility of reprioritising internal resources or securing external borrowing as prescribed by the Council's Constitution and Financial Regulations;

- (d) take other action necessary to develop and fund the scheme, including making any decision which is necessary or desirable under the provisions of agreements for external grants and submit the detailed project approval in line with the Council's Capital Approval process once the final funding arrangements become clear;
- (e) approve in principle the submission of an application for planning permission and other statutory consents for the LDV Flood Defence Scheme;
- (f) approve in principle measures to deliver works on privately owned properties or land essential to implement the scheme by enforcement if required, including available powers to gain entry to sites under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and Land Drainage Act 1994, or the use of the Council's Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Powers to secure access to any parcels of land essential to implement the scheme; and
- (g) negotiate, agree and complete the contracts for detailed design and construction following a tender process and once a full funding package is in place.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

- 9.3.1 The preferred approach is to deliver a comprehensive and holistic approach to flood management taking advantage of the limited availability of public funds.
- 9.3.2 The 'do nothing' option is not viable as it depends on the private sector leading which, in the current economic climate, would at best deliver a partial yet uncoordinated scheme, and, at worst, would deliver no defences at all. A 'reduced scheme' similarly will not provide adequate protection and security to the majority of businesses in the flood zone, while the 'alternative technology' and 'up-stream storage' options would be complementary solutions in the right circumstances but would not alone resolve the issue of flood risk in the LDV.
- 9.3.3 The proposed solution of a comprehensive programme of works would meet Environment Agency standards and would provide the greatest level of protection to business and employment premises and land in the Don Valley. It would thus give existing and new investors confidence in the area.

9.3.4 Furthermore, this solution is based on evidence of business enthusiasm which gives confidence that financial commitments may be forthcoming from key private sector stakeholders who have stated a desire for flood defences in the area. It also delivers the highest level of outputs, outcomes and benefits.

9.3.5 As a comprehensive and holistic solution, this preferred option does require the largest budget and therefore the largest amount of funding. Positive progress has been made in applying for ERDF and EA funding which could amount to around 75% of total costs. The aim is to complete detailed funding applications to ERDF and the EA to secure these funds. The majority of the private sector contribution relating to the construction phase would be cashflowed in the short term by Sheffield City Council with a view to retrieving this through the establishment of a Business Improvement District.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Details of the options considered to achieve '1 in 100 year event' protection are provided below with the recommended approach.

9.4.2 **Do nothing option**

Without a coordinated and comprehensive flood defence strategy, piece-meal and isolated interventions would be implemented by individual private sector business or landowners, at different times and possibly to different standards.

9.4.3 **Reduced funding option**

With less funding a smaller scheme tackling selected weak points could be led by the Council and attract private contributions from businesses. However, this would not achieve the '1 in 100 year event' standard with some weak points remaining and consequently a continued risk of flooding for many businesses.

9.4.4 **Alternative technology option**

New technologies are being developed which may be feasible components of a flood defence strategy for the LDV as alternatives to traditional walls, but will not remedy flood risk for the entire flood zone on their own.

9.4.5 **Up-stream storage option**

Managing lower water levels in up-stream reservoirs is a vital component of the wider flood defence strategy in Sheffield by reducing the amount of water arriving in the valley bottom, but will not alone prevent flooding in the LDV.

9.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

9.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

9.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

9.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

10. SUPPORTING SHEFFIELD PEOPLE WITH DEMENTIA TO LIVE WELL

10.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report describing some of the changes needed to modernise the support for people with dementia who live at home, following a three month Involvement Exercise authorised by Cabinet on 23 May, 2012. The purpose of the involvement exercise had been to understand the key issues for people affected by dementia in order to plan support for the future in light of the growing number of people with dementia representing a significant issue for the City and that existing support arrangements will not meet the increase in demand or the changing expectations of people with dementia.

The report summarised the results of the Involvement Exercise, made a number of proposals for the way in which the Council would invest in supporting people with dementia, described how the Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust would further consult on the shape of its services and set out how the identified service savings were to be achieved to meet the Council's budgetary requirements.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the outcome of the Involvement Exercise and, in particular, thanks the Alzheimer's Society for the production of the report on the views of people with dementia;
- (b) acknowledges in the light of this that support for people with dementia needs to change;
- (c) agrees to consult with people with dementia and their carers on how services can be changed in the light of these findings and to achieve the required savings and asks the Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust to work with the City Council in this consultation exercise.
- (d) agrees that the consultation exercise referred to in (c) above will

include consulting on how alternative, and a wider range of support and services, and the increased use of personal budgets could be developed to allow the potential closure of Norbury by the end of March 2013 and Bole Hill View by March 2014.

- (e) grants delegated authority to the Executive Director, Communities to:-
 - (i) finalise arrangements for carrying out the consultation exercise referred to in (c) above, including making appropriate arrangements with Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust; and
 - (ii) implement such changes to the provision of services for people with dementia as he shall consider appropriate, such authority to be exercised following the conclusion of the consultation exercise and having due regard to its outcome, and in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, and further provided that all associated costs are covered by available budgets.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The responses to the Involvement Exercise summarised in this report identified some shortcomings in the existing support arrangements for people with dementia and the need for change. It also highlighted practice changes which will help them to live well at home.
- 10.3.2 The report recognises the need to ensure adequate investment in services to support people with dementia in the early stages and also for those people with complex needs.
- 10.3.3 In addition, it sets out the requirement to identify savings. It proposes to achieve those savings through exploring the potential to reduce the number of buildings needed to deliver the service whilst maintaining the overall service levels.
- 10.3.4 It sets out a plan for consultation on these proposals to be undertaken by the Sheffield City Council and Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 In consultation with Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust, the Council considered reducing the level of support across the service but this would have had a significant impact on people with dementia and the people who care for them. Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust undertook an options appraisal on which of the resource centre buildings should be retained which included criteria about the location, suitability for development capacity and the likelihood of achieving the necessary savings. The conclusion was that looking at existing buildings retaining

Hurlfield View represented the most viable option.

10.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

10.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

10.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Richard Webb, Executive Director, Communities

10.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care