

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 27 February 2013

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Leigh Bramall, Jackie Drayton, Harry Harpham (Deputy Chair), Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Bryan Lodge and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Isobel Bowler.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No resolutions were moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillor Jack Scott declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 11 – Voluntary Sector Grant Aid Investment in 2013/14 on the grounds that he was employed by Voluntary Action Sheffield and left the meeting during the consideration of the item.

3.2 2. Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a personal interest in item 11 – Voluntary Sector Grant Aid Investment in 2013/14 on the grounds that he was a member of the Foxhill and Parson Cross Advice Service Ltd.)

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 13th February, 2013 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question on Cleared Sites Contract Cabinet report – Green Estate Ltd

5.2 Bridget Ingle asked as part of the tender process, will potential contractors be required to demonstrate that they provide the same level of support to local communities as the existing contractor Green Estate Ltd? For example, Green Estate worked with people on social care budgets and offered long term volunteering opportunities. The impact of this commitment and socially beneficial approach was much greater than a requirement to 'demonstrate a willingness to provide volunteering opportunities where appropriate' which is mentioned in the current Cabinet report. As a social enterprise organisation, Green Estate had very different aims and objectives when compared to other commercial contractors. Ms. Ingle also asked had there been an

evaluation of the impact of their work within local communities over and above the maintenance of cleared sites?’

- 5.3 She also asked whether the procurement process is in line with the Social Value Act introduced last year and did the Council consider the social value work that Green Estate undertook in Wincobank to be invaluable and she was sure it was in the case of other areas of Sheffield and that, by attending the meeting today she wanted to make sure that other potential contractors would offer the same level of support if they were awarded the contract.
- 5.4 Ms Ingle therefore asked how the proposed service to be procured might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the relevant area, and how, in conducting the process of procurement, the Council might act with a view to securing that improvement.
- 5.5 Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) responded that he recognised the excellent work that Green Estate Limited had undertaken across the City as one of the Council’s partners but that the Council had to ensure that it met its responsibilities in achieving value for money on behalf of Council taxpayers. He stated that every Council contract let was based 70% on price and 30% on quality which included consideration of the number of apprentices employed by contractors, visits made to schools and work experience placements. The Cleared Sites contract would afford training opportunities by the contractor who was successful in securing the contract and the Council would be seeking added value in the contract through the offer of volunteering opportunities and the payment of the Living Wage and this would have a bearing on the award of the contract. However, he re-iterated that the Council had to bear in mind contract cost because of the financial situation the Council found itself in and the need to fulfil its duty to Council taxpayers.

5.6 Public Question on Provision of Meat for Schools

- 5.7 Nigel Slack referred to a piece about the horsemeat scandal in the Lancaster Guardian of 18th February, 2013 which mentioned Sheffield Schools and quoted the following text from that publication:-

“...Meanwhile, Sheffield Council said it had suspended the use of all processed meat in school meals with immediate effect, as a precautionary measure to protect student safety. The decision was made jointly with its catering company, the council said...”

Mr Slack referred to the fact that he had seen no comment on this in local press and asked whether Lancashire schools were supplied by Taylor Shaw, as Sheffield schools were?

- 5.8 He also asked, as part of this precautionary approach, had Taylor Shaw undertaken any test on produce supplied by them and had the Council? If so, what were the results and if not, why not?
- 5.9 Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) referred to the large degrees of publicity given to the use of horse meat in processed foods but that the Council had initially been satisfied that, under its contract with Taylor Shaw, there was little processed food supplied for use by schools, with most of the meat being purchased being of a high quality from Underwood's in Rotherham. The Council was also satisfied with its other supplier of meat products. However, as the food chain became more stretched the City Council decided with Taylor Shaw that it would be best to withdraw the little processed meat products that were supplied to the Council for use in schools as a precautionary measure pending further tests being carried out by the Food Standards Agency on supplies in order to detect whether they had been contaminated..
- 5.10 Councillor Drayton added that the Council had drawn attention to this action on the schools intraweb and that she and the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, had written to Head-teachers and Chairs of School Governors advising them that if they were not in receipt of meat products from Taylor Shaw, they should consider taking similar action to that taken by the Council. She was also satisfied that there would be no contamination of hal hal meat due the Council using chicken and lamb and because of the method of slaughter. She also referred to the fact that Taylor Shaw were talking to Underwood's on the possibility of using high quality mince for beef burgers
- 5.11 Councillor Drayton re-iterated that the Council had issued a press release to reassure people that the Council was redoubling its efforts to ensure meat products were free from contamination. In terms of the suppliers to schools in Lancashire, Councillor Drayton indicated that she would respond to Mr Slack on this in due course.
- 5.12 Public Question on Proposed Demolition of Edwardian Wing of the Jessop's Hospital
- 5.13 Nigel Slack expressed concern at the decisions made by the City Centre and West Planning and Highways Committee in December, 2012 and on 25th February, 2013 concerning the demolition of the Edwardian wing of the former Jessop Hospital for Women. He alleged that there was clearly doubt as to the legality of the decisions made, both in December and on the 25th February and would the Council look into this via a Scrutiny Committee?
- 5.14 Mr Slack commented on what he considered to be flaws in the case made by the University of Sheffield for additional space and in their submission of the application for permission to demolish the

Edwardian wing, particularly the failure to explore alternative solutions. He suggested that if the demolition took place, then this would destroy a vital part of Sheffield's built heritage. He asked was there a member of this Cabinet that will stand up for the heritage of Sheffield, as well as it's future, and oppose this decision and would the Council (a) support it's own planning statement that :-

"Sheffield has a very rich history and this is reflected in its diverse built environment. We believe it is important to recognise and work to protect our built heritage across the City." (Source: Sheffield City Council website)

or (b) set a precedent for future development where heritage is less important than economics?

5.15 Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) responded that Planning Committees were not decision making bodies in the sense that they of Council policy and that the Committees were charged with considering individual planning applications, basing its decisions on current national planning laws and, therefore such decisions could not be referred to scrutiny and the decision taken on the Jessop's building would stand.

5.16 Councillor Bramall stated that he was satisfied that the decision had been taken properly, but he indicated that he would examine the comments made by Mr Slack further and respond to him in due course. Councillor Bramall believed that the new development would be economically beneficial in the long-run supporting the City's strategy of expanding Advanced Manufacturing. He stated that the Council had good reputation as regards the protection of historic buildings and had, over a number of years compiled a list of buildings that were of significant historical importance although they were not listed and had also worked hard to refurbish buildings with a view to removing them from the buildings at risk register.

5.17 Public Questions of Redesign of Early Years Service

A number of questions were asked in relation to the Redesign of the Early Years Service in respect of the following:-

5.18 Liz Russo, representing Ellesmere Children's Centre, asked how places for children from those centres which would have to be closed would be found when the waiting lists for Local Authority Children's Centres were already oversubscribed? She asked why this had happened and who would address the situation?

5.19 Safine Ali Sheh questioned how the proposals would impact on staff currently working in the children's centres and whether their experience and qualifications would be wasted if they were made

redundant as a result of the proposals?

- 5.20 Lena Mohammed commented that all childcare providers in Fir Vale had moved to providing childcare during term time only and questioned how this provision could continue when funding was being cut for the under 2 year olds?
- 5.21 Peter Davies, representing the GMB Union, reported that he had submitted a five page document to the meeting of Children, Young People and Families Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 24th January, 2013 which had called-in the Cabinet decision to consult on the proposals. As yet he had not received a response to the document. He stated that this was an important issue for GMB members who were now vulnerable to redundancy. He had further submitted questions to the Full Council meeting but again had received no response. He therefore asked when he would be receiving a response to his questions?
- 5.22 Abtisam Mohammed, representing the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Network, referred to a comment in the officer report which she believed to be racist and which had upset a number of members of the BME community and therefore questioned why officers considered this appropriate to be included within a public document?
- 5.23 Emma Grundy referred to the consultation which had been undertaken within childcare settings and referred to the difficulty which many parents had filling in the questionnaire when English was not their first language. She believed that this was not taken into account in the consultation and as a result many parents were not able to complete the questionnaire in the way that they would have wished to. She asked why it was not possible to include verbal comments in the report.
- 5.24 Clare Ward, representing Darnall Community Nursery, asked how confident the Council were of the figures they had quoted for children entitled to Free Educational Learning (FEL) given that at a briefing meeting held prior to the Cabinet meeting one area was told that only 22 children were eligible but there were 24 children already in the local area before the publicity had commenced.
- 5.25 Elaine Bennett asked why FEL money could not be used to subsidise childcare for the 0-2 year olds and why did the report not address the lack of funding for working parents in disadvantaged areas?
- 5.26 Leanne McMMain asked why it had been stated in the consultation/questionnaire that funding would be provided for children with special educational needs and for those children in deprived areas when it was those children who would be most directly affected by the proposals.

- 5.27 Tracy Lee, representing Woodthorpe and Wybourn Children's Centres, commented that staff had consistently identified the need for detailed negotiation on the proposals with Council staff and this had not been forthcoming. As a result of the proposals the Centres would have to close on 29th March and 61 children would have to be placed in other settings when there were insufficient places already?. She therefore asked where these children would go and who would ensure their safety?
- 5.28 Sally Pearse, representing Tinsley Parents and Children's Consortium, asked what the Council's reason was for believing the settings in areas of disadvantage could become sustainable? If it was believed that the FEL money would suffice, why would the Council not agree temporary transitional funding until the two year FEL was fully in place?
- 5.29 Tracy Wright commented that, as a provider of adult training courses, she was concerned that parents were being told that they could no longer access training as there would no longer be childcare for the under 2's because of the funding cuts. She asked what the Council would do to meet these parents' needs as the courses could lead to employment and other opportunities?
- 5.30 Rahida Sharif asked how long the Council believed it would take parents to take up the 2 year FEL offer given that the subsidy for centres was ending next month and no publicity on the offer had started?
- 5.31 Linda Edwards asked two questions. She questioned whether, given that the consultation contains information that was often difficult to understand, would the Council allow all the evidence to be examined and inspected by an independent group of statisticians with a view to simplifying the information for members of the public?
- 5.32 She further referred to paragraph 4.6.9 of the officer report which acknowledged the significant level of concern about the closure of provision and stated that what was evident was that there was inequity across the City. She commented that this was correct but questioned how ceasing the funding to childcare providers would address this inequity?
- 5.33 Emma Chadwick asked why the DVD which had been made by parents and contained a number of questions from parents who had been unable to attend the meeting had not been allowed to be shown. She referred to statistics which showed that 34% of referrals to Multi-Agency Support Teams (MAST) were made by Early Years professionals and questioned why the Council were driving the MAST service forward which appeared to have little need when Early Years professionals were being made redundant. Ms Chadwick finally asked why had £1m been spent on the Fairness Commission which had

highlighted issues with MAST and asked had the money been well spent and why had this been ignored by the Leader of the Council?

- 5.34 In response the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore stated that the Fairness Commission had not cost £1m; this was the funding which had been set aside to implement the recommendations of the Commission. The Commission itself had cost nothing other than administration costs. The Council, had, however, spent money on deprived areas on the consequences of welfare reform, such as Council Tax benefit reductions and the “bedroom tax”
- 5.35 Councillor Jackie Drayton stated that there were many families within disadvantaged areas who were not currently accessing FEL funding. It was important to work with community providers to meet with the families and inform them of the funding opportunities available through FEL and their rights to this funding which was available all year and not just in term time. For example, part-time single parents, working two hours in the early evening, could access funding for childcare which would have been available in term-time only.
- 5.36 Councillor Drayton commented that it was important that low paid working parents had access to full time childcare. The Council needed to ensure that provision stretched across the whole year. However, she stated that the £3.8m funding allocated to FEL was money which had been taken from the Early Intervention Grant and the Council needed to work together with providers to ensure the quality of service continued to be provided.
- 5.37 In response to the questions from GMB, she commented that she had attended the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee that was referred to and was not made aware of the document and questions. She stated that most of the questions posed had been answered at the meeting but if Mr Davies believed his questions had not been addressed he should contact Councillor Drayton.
- 5.38 Councillor stated that the consultation had not simply been about the questionnaires. Councillor Drayton apologised if people felt they couldn't understand what was in the questionnaires and she hoped that those people who supported people filling in the questionnaires would assist parents who had a problem. The consultation had taken place over a number of years and the campaign against the redesigned services and, in effect, formed part of the consultation and some aspects of the Council's proposals had been altered as a result of responses received.
- 5.39 She did not believe that the withdrawal of funding was affecting some areas of the City disproportionately and the withdrawal of the Early Intervention Grant would impact on the City as a whole. Savings had been made in premises costs, management costs and administration and childcare providers should look at their own structures to see if

similar savings could be made. It was important to emphasise that £6.8m had been cut from the Early Intervention Grant and savings had to be made as a result. It was vital, however, that childcare provision could continue and the Council was working with existing providers and alternative providers to ensure this in the next financial year.

5.40 The Council understood that many organisations were key parts of their communities and were keen to see them continue but the Council could no longer afford to provide subsidy grants given that the funding had been withdrawn by the Government. Councillor Drayton cautioned that it was crucial that organisations/providers became sustainable this year as the Council were facing a further £50m cut next year.

5.41 Councillor Drayton acknowledged that the comment in the report referred to by some of the questioners should not have been included. Although this was a comment made during the consultation and not an officer comment, it still should not have been included and was totally unacceptable and she therefore apologised for any offence taken.

5.42 The EIA had requested that a responder state their nationality and ethnic origin and a breakdown of the figures could be provided. The EIA had acknowledged that the proposals would impact on staff and up to 50 jobs would be lost within the Council but it was stated in the report that every effort would be made to ensure some provision across all areas. It was recognised that staff providing services were vulnerable and the Council would seek to address this and help maintain services where it could.

5.43 Dawn Walton (Assistant Director, Prevention and Early Intervention) commented that the discrepancies in the figures of those qualified for FEL, referred to by a questioner may have been a result of the fact that the Council collected data in respect of two year olds from Health Authority data. However, there may have been some two year olds who travelled in from other areas which may have had an impact on the figures.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

6.1 The Cabinet noted that (i) no items had been called-in for scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet and (ii) the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee had, at its meeting on 27th February, 2013, considered the report of the Executive Director, Children Young People and Families Service, regarding the Redesign of Early Years Services which was due to be considered by this meeting.

6.2 At the above-mentioned meeting of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Members heard from the Cabinet Member, Council Officers and members of the public. After discussion, the Committee made the following recommendations to Cabinet:-

6.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, Executive Director and appropriate officers be requested to report to a July meeting of this Committee in order to:

(a) report back on the transitional arrangements offered to various affected organisations; and

(b) provide an update on the Communication Strategy and its' effectiveness.

6.4 Councillor Gill Furniss, (Chair of the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee), attended the meeting and advised Cabinet that numerous public questions had been received at the meeting which had examined a number of matters including establishing a crisis fund, accessibility to childcare and transitional arrangements. The Committee had expressed particular concern about how transitional arrangements would be managed and, therefore, had asked for a further report to the Committee on these arrangements in July 2013. She added that the Committee believed that there should be a clear Communications Strategy to ensure that parents and providers fully understood the impact of the Council's proposals and the childcare that would continue to be available.

6.5 Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families) thanked the Scrutiny Committee who had now met with parents and providers to examine the proposals for the Early Years' Service on two occasions. Unfortunately at the present time, the detail of the transitional plans still had to be worked on, but it was important, over the next two months that these were clearly defined and communicated promptly to providers and parents. Therefore, further meetings were planned with organisations to discuss how the Council was taking forward its proposals. Councillor Drayton added that she would be happy to attend a further meeting of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee to discuss the Council's proposals further.

7. **RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

The Chief Executive submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

RESOLVED: That this Cabinet :-

(a) places on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the City Council by the following staff in the Portfolios below:-

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years'</u> <u>Service</u>
-------------	-------------	---------------------------------

Children, Young People and Families

John Towers	Buildings Supervisor, St Theresa's Catholic Primary School	22
-------------	--	----

Susan Whitlock	Deputy Headteacher, Gleadless Primary School	38
----------------	--	----

Margaret Askham	Learning Support Teacher	23
-----------------	--------------------------	----

Resources

Kath Todhunter	HR Consultant	25
----------------	---------------	----

Place

Janet Crabtree	Programme Manager, Housing, Enterprise and Regeneration Service	41
----------------	---	----

(b) extends to them its best wishes for the future and a long and happy retirement; and

(c) directs that an appropriate extract of this resolution under the Common Seal of the Council be forwarded to them.

8. REDESIGN OF THE EARLY YEARS' SERVICE - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION

8.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report the outcomes of the consultation carried out between early December 2012 and early February 2013 and associated update of the equality assessments and to seek approval for the final recommendations in respect of the redesign of early years services.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet having taken into consideration all the background documents referred to in the report now submitted:-

- (a) to develop a revised action plan for a quality framework and make this available to all providers in line with comments from the consultation and in recognition of the Government proposals for Improving Quality and Changes to Regulatory Regime outlined in the DfE publication 'More Great Childcare', and the Government Bill, Children and Families Bill 2012-13 (first reading House of Commons, 4 February 2013;
- (b) approves the transition plans as set out in this report;
- (c) notes the findings from the consultation and revised equality impact assessments;

- (d) approves the following revised recommendations:-
- (i) to develop a revised action plan for a quality framework and make this available to all providers in line with comments from the consultation and in recognition of the Government proposals for Improving Quality and Changes to Regulatory Regime outlined in the DfE publication 'More Great Childcare', and the Government Bill, Children and Families Bill 2012-13 (first reading House of Commons, 4 February 2013;
 - (ii) to reorganise the 36 Ofsted - registered Children's Centres into 17 areas each with a named main site and a number of outreach delivery sites;
 - (iii) to note that the 17 areas have been amended following suggestions from the consultation process;
 - (iv) that a statutory process be undertaken to deregister the 19 centres that no longer require Ofsted registration;
 - (v) that the present policy of "block purchasing" premises and hosting payments will cease and in the future "spot purchase" of venues will be undertaken when and where they are needed;
 - (vi) to develop a comprehensive communication plan to inform parents of the venues and the types of support available in the new 17 areas;
 - (vii) to cease childcare subsidy grants to 20 providers in the Private Voluntary and Independent and Statutory sector on 31st March 2013;
 - (viii) that the local authority will offer to continue to work with these providers, on an individual basis, over a three month period to give them support to develop their business plans for their organisation and to help them become sustainable, these plans to include financial forecasts, management costs, staffing structures and ways to develop flexible and accessible services to children and families and assist in seeking other forms of income;
 - (ix) to transfer the management and delivery of 7 Local Authority nurseries, by continuing the transfer of 3 nurseries to Schools, and to progress the transfer of the 4 remaining nurseries within the childcare market, in line with local authority employment policies and negotiation with trade unions in order to retain qualified staff across the sector;

- (x) that existing contracts with the providers set out in Appendix 2 are not renewed and for time limited transitional arrangements to be put in place based on service demand and to accommodate Procurement Employment Legislation where applicable;
- (xi) that specifications for procurement of targeted services required to fulfil the Council's statutory duties will be developed; and
- (xii) that Cabinet notes and approves that decisions made to implement the recommendations will be made by the Cabinet member or officers in accordance with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 The decision has been made taking into account the outcomes of the communication and consultation process, which commenced in early December 2012 and concluded in early February 2013, around the in principle proposals set out in the Cabinet paper of 12 December, 2012. The decision is necessary in order to redesign and streamline early years' services to make savings across management, administration and premises and prioritising early intervention and family support services that are flexible, accessible and of high quality.

8.3.2 The size, depth of the savings proposed and the timescale are as a result of the severe Government cuts to funding and changes in Government strategies for early years.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 These recommendations follow the original proposals that were put to Cabinet in December 2012. Alterations to the original proposals have been made to reflect the consultation that has taken place. In compiling the original proposals alternatives were considered:-

- To make no changes. This is not possible given the reductions to funding and Government policy changes
- To outsource all early years activities. This is not possible at this time due to the breadth of changes required and the potential change to the role of local authorities in respect of early year's services.

8.4.2 The proposals outlined and the changes made are in line with the local authority's statutory duties and responsibilities that with the restricted financial position take priority to maintain.

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

Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families.

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Children, Young People and Family Support.

9. CLEARED SITES CONTRACT 2013/16

9.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report referring to the current Cleared Sites Contract used to manage and maintain cleared Council-owned sites (predominantly housing demolition sites) prior to their eventual disposal and/or development. He stated that the contract expired in April 2013, but would be extended by three months to allow for completion of the procurement process. Therefore, in order to keep these sites tidy, safe and well-maintained, the Council would need to re-procure the contract and secure a new contractor to deliver these services over the coming years.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the procurement of a contractor, by way of competitive tender, to deliver the services that form the Cleared Sites Contract 2013/16; and
- (b) grants delegated powers to the Director of Commercial Services, or his nominated representative, to accept tenders and award a Contract for this Project, in consultation with the Director of Housing, Enterprise and Regeneration.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The current Cleared Sites contract expires in April 2013 and is then going to be extended by 3 months. The re-procurement and award of a new contract to cover the period July 2013 to April 2016 will allow for the continued management of the sites in the programme, keeping them tidy, well-maintained and safe, as well as increasing the attractiveness of the sites to potential developers as and when they are advertised for sale and development.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

9.4.1 One alternative option to re-procuring the Cleared Sites contract would be to let the current contract expire and not renew it. Whilst there would be obvious and immediate cost savings associated with this approach, the option was disregarded due to the substantial potential problems – both reputational and financial – that could arise if the cleared sites were not being maintained adequately. Many sites would become overgrown and unmanageable very quickly, and past experience suggests that poorly maintained sites attract increased instances of fly tipping and other anti-social behaviour, as well as reducing the potential saleability and developability of the land. Sites could very easily become trouble spots and excessive plant and weed growth could hide numerous dangers (hazardous tipped materials, drug paraphernalia, broken glass, etc.), jeopardising the safety of local residents.

9.4.2 Another alternative to procuring an external contractor would be to use an in-house team from Parks & Countryside to carry out the works. Commercial Services approached the Director of Culture and Environment, who declined the opportunity.

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**

Safer and Stronger Communities.

10. VOCATIONAL SKILLS PROVISION 2014-16

10.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report seeking permission to continue commissioning the Vocational Skills Programme (VSP) for learners at Key Stage 4 for the academic years 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16. The VSP was organised by the Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities on behalf of schools and academies and made available off-site provision at college or with other providers for learners of all abilities, including those 14-16 year olds at risk of disengagement.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the undertaking of a procurement exercise in accordance with Council Standing Orders and EU regulations for the 14-16 Vocational Skills Programme for the period 2013-16 inclusive; and
- (b) delegates powers to the Director of Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities to proceed to contract after the procurement exercise has been completed without further recourse to Cabinet.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The continuance of the VSP preserves an essential part of the City's offer to Key Stage 4 learners, providing an introduction to vocational and employability skills which will be of great value in informing their post-16 choices and encouraging successful progression.
- 10.3.2 The VSP actively seeks to re-engage those learners at Key Stage 4 who are at risk of disengaging from learning and contributes therefore to the City's strategy for driving down 16-18 Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs) and in meeting the local authority's new statutory obligations associated with the Raising of the Participation Age (RPA) legislation.
- 10.3.3 The VSP offers an important opportunity for school-age young people to prepare for adult life and work by equipping them with the necessary skills, experience of the workplace and the vocational qualifications. It also helps furnish the workforce of the future with the attributes and competencies that will be needed for a strong and healthy local economy.
- 10.3.4 The VSP is connected strategically and contributes significantly to a range of important skills and employment initiatives in the City, as organised by the City Council and its partners including Future:proof, the 100 Apprenticeship initiative; the City Deal and the *Made in Sheffield* curriculum.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 The VSP could be terminated at the end of the 2012/13 academic year and schools, academies and the PRU required to organise their own off-site provision. The result would almost certainly be a return to the fragmented and unsatisfactory arrangements that existed before the city's schools asked the local authority to organise a structured, high quality and cost-effective VSP on their behalf. The benefits of a centrally procured, managed and quality assured network of training providers would be lost. Schools would have to duplicate these functions on an individual basis, with a consequent wastage of resource across the city. Not having the necessary expertise and experience in place would lead to potentially variable quality of health and safety, safeguarding and delivery arrangements thereby increasingly placing individual learners at risk. This option was rejected for these reasons.

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**

Jayne Ludlam,, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families.

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

Children, Young People and Family Support.

11. **SHEFFIELD LOCAL PLAN (FORMERLY SHEFFIELD DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) : PRE-SUBMISSION VERSION OF CITY POLICIES AND SITES DOCUMENT AND PROPOSALS MAP**

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeks Cabinet's approval of the Council's final version of the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) endorses the current version of the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map for publication;
- (b) refers this report and the documents to the next (non-budget) meeting of the full Council for approval for publication, invitation of formal representations and submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government;and
- (c) authorises the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Business Skills and Development to take all necessary procedural steps following the formal representations to enable the schedule of any changes to the document and Proposals Map to be submitted to the Secretary of State.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 The document and map help to implement the adopted Core Strategy and to meet statutory and national policy requirements. They take account of previous consultation and have been subject to sustainability appraisal

and equality impact assessment. They are needed to guide the process of development management and to update the current Unitary Development Plan policies, adopted 14 years ago.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

11.4.1 Alternative options were fully considered and consulted on at the Emerging Options stage of the earlier City Policies and City Sites documents. The more strategic choices were largely determined by the Core Strategy and the choice with many of the policy criteria and allocations is whether to have them or not. However, there were alternative options for many of the criteria (e.g. a higher standard or a lower one than what is proposed) and choices about the required uses for allocation sites. These will be detailed in the Background Reports to be published in time for the representations, which will contain fuller evidence for the selection and rejection of options for policies and proposals.

11.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

11.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

11.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

12. VOLUNTARY SECTOR GRANT AID INVESTMENT IN 2013/14

12.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report seeking approval for recommended awards from the Voluntary Sector Grants Fund for the period 1st April 2013 to 31st March 2014 and to operate a Lunch Clubs Fund.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet (a) having had due regard to the provisions of Sections 149 and 158 of the Equality Act 2010 and Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and to the issues raised by those provisions, approves the grant award recommendations listed in Appendix 1;-

(b) notes that the new advice service delivery model will be delivered

through one single organisation, rather than a small number of larger and sustainable organisations as referred to in paragraph 3.4 of the report.

- (c) endorses the award process described in Section 5 and to approve the actions, arrangements and recommendations at Sections 6 and 12, and the following specific delegations:-
 - (i) the Director, Policy, Partnership and Research be authorised:-
 - (A) to administer the Lunch Clubs Fund as described in Appendix 1;
 - (B) to agree the terms of and authorise the completion of all funding agreements relating to grants made from the Voluntary Sector Grants Fund and the Lunch Clubs Fund ('the Grant Funds'), together with any other associated agreements or arrangements that he may consider appropriate, provided that if the terms of a proposed funding agreement involve the variation of any standard terms previously agreed by Internal Audit and / or Legal Services the agreement shall not be completed without the consent of the Chief Internal Auditor and the Director of Legal Services;
 - (C) where (a) a change of circumstance affects the ability of an organisation to deliver the purpose of the grant awarded, (b) the Director considers the performance of the organisation to be below an acceptable standard or (c) an organisation has breached any of the award conditions contained in their funding agreement, to review, adjust or suspend grant awards
 - (ii) the Director, Policy, Partnership and Research, in consultation with Cabinet Member for Communities, and Inclusion, be authorised:-
 - (A) to carry out during the first six months of 2013-14 a review of the service provided by Shopmobility Sheffield and to decide the amount of grant (if any) to be awarded to Shopmobility Sheffield for the period from 1st October 2013 to 31st March 2014 and the terms on which this is paid;
 - (B) to agree the amounts, purposes and recipients of any individual grants awarded in year from the Grant Funds including any additional sums received or returned or unpaid funds;
 - (C) where (1) a change of circumstance affects the ability of an organisation to deliver the purpose of the grant awarded or (2) the Director considers the performance of the organisation to be below an acceptable standard or (3) an organisation has

breached any of the award conditions contained in their funding agreement, to withdraw grant awards.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 The reason for the recommendations is to support the local voluntary sector by making awards of funding from the Council grant aid budget. The purpose of grant aid investment is :-

- to mobilise volunteering and promote active citizenship;
- to provide experience and training opportunities for local people and create jobs;
- to provide important services for local citizens and innovative responses to emerging social needs;
- to enable voluntary organisations to draw in external funding and boost the local economy;

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 No alternatives were considered as the purpose was to report the outcome of implementing a previous decision made by Cabinet to manage a grant aid process.

12.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

12.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

12.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

John Mothersole, Chief Executive.

12.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Safer and Stronger Communities

(NOTE: 1. Councillor Jack Scott declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the above item on the grounds that he was employed by Voluntary Action Sheffield and left the meeting during the consideration of the item.

2. Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a personal interest in the above item on the grounds that he was a member of the Foxhill and Parson Cross

Advice Service Ltd.)

13. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT SEVENAIRS ROAD, BEIGHTON

13.1 The Executive Director, Communities, submitted a report referring to the fact that the Guinness Northern Counties has secured an allocation of grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Affordable Homes Programme for 2011/15 and which included funding for supported accommodation for those experiencing mental ill health, which formed part of Sheffield's Local Investment Plan as approved by Cabinet on 24 August 2011.

13.1.2 It was explained in the report that a suitable site has been identified at Sevenairs Road in Beighton and that the delivery of the scheme required the Council to dispose of this land at nil consideration.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) declares the land now shown at Appendix A to be surplus to the requirements of the City Council and, subject to planning permission, be disposed of to Guinness Northern Counties at nil consideration for use as social housing; and

(b) authorises the Director of Property and Facilities Management to (i) agree final terms for the disposal of the site to deliver the scheme set out in the report, including the variation of any boundaries as required, in consultation with the Director of Housing Enterprise and Regeneration and (ii) instruct the Director of Legal Services to complete the necessary legal documentation.

13.3 Reasons for Decision

13.3.1 There is currently an under provision of specialist supported housing for people who experience mental ill health in Sheffield. The need has been identified for more housing with flexible support to meet the needs of a younger population with mental health problems who require short to medium term support to enable their recovery towards greater independence. This gap in provision has led to a number of people being inappropriately accommodated in expensive registered residential care. The proposed development would benefit clients across the city due to the increase in choice and dispersal of resources.

13.3.2 There is a particular gap in provision in the south east of the city where there are no suitable units of supported housing for this client group. Clients from this area have to relocate to central/north Sheffield for rehabilitation placements, which has removed some from their neighbourhood and family ties. The Sevenairs Road site represents the best available option within the south east of the city in terms of affordability and access to amenities

13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

13.4.1 Other sites were considered and GNC conducted a search for suitable private sector land in the south east of the city. Some sites were provisionally identified but they did not compare to Sevenairs Road in terms of affordability and access to amenities.

13.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

13.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

13.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Richard Webb, Executive Director, Communities.

13.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Safer and Stronger Communities

14. PRIORITY SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME - FOX HILL AND PRINCE EDWARD SCHOOLS

14.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report highlighting the inclusion of Fox Hill and Prince Edward Primary Schools in the Government-led Priority School Building Programme (PSBP) and requesting the necessary permissions required to enable Prince Edward new school to be built on an adjacent site

14.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for each school has been signed by the Chief Executive;
- (b) notes that there will be no loss of Public Open Space due to the development of better quality facilities with public access provided by a Community Use Agreement (CUA);
- (c) approves the inclusion of the site adjacent to the existing Prince Edward Primary School in Appendix A as the site for the new school and notes the proposed substitution of the former Bluestone School site in Appendix B to the Sheffield Housing Company (SHC) in compliance with the terms of the Development Agreement, dated 7th July 2011 in respect to the completion of the land package; and

- (d) pending a formal decision to dispose of the former Bluestone School site to the SHC, confirms that the former Bluestone School site must not be used or committed for use for any other purpose without a decision of Cabinet.

14.3 Reasons for Decision

- 14.3.1 The successful inclusion in the PSBP provides an opportunity to address significant building condition and suitability issues at Fox Hill and Prince Edward Primary Schools;
- 14.3.2 The agreement to proceed within the existing site boundary at Fox Hill and on the preferred neighbouring site to Prince Edward will enable the new schools to be developed with minimal disruption to the existing pupils on sites that will continue to be accessible to the current catchment area.

14.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 14.4.1 Do Nothing: If it is decided not to continue to support the Education Funding Agency to develop plans to rebuild the 2 primary schools in the City, the opportunity for greatly needed investment into the Sheffield school estate would be lost.
- 14.4.2 Continue with Asset Management Planning and Maintenance: As highlighted at paragraph 2.4, over £5m is required to maintain these schools over the next 3-5 years. Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) currently receive an allocation of £6.5m (2012/13) to invest in maintenance programmes for all CYPF properties, which includes 170 schools where an estimated £121m investment is required in the 133 primary schools alone.
- 14.4.3 Use Existing Capital Allocations to Rebuild Schools: Current annual capital allocations (2012/13) total around £11m for the provision of school places and the maintenance of all CYPF estate.
- 14.4.4 To divert this funding away from the planned school expansions, new school buildings to provide additional places and building maintenance programmes would mean the authority would not be able to meet its statutory duty 'to ensure the provision of 'sufficient' schools' for the provision of primary and secondary education in their area' and ensure premises regulations are being adhered to.

14.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

14.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

14.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Jayne Ludlam, Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families.

14.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Children, Young People and Family Support.

15. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT RICHMOND PARK DRIVE

15.1 The Executive Director, Communities, submitted a report on funding secured by Sanctuary Housing Association from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Affordable Homes Programme for 2011/15, which included funding for the delivery of a scheme at Richmond Park Drive, which required the Council to dispose of this land at nil consideration.

15.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) declares the land now shown at Appendix A to be surplus to the requirements of the City Council and, subject to planning permission, to be disposed of to Sanctuary Affordable Housing Ltd at nil consideration for use as social housing; and
- (b) authorises the Director of Property and Facilities Management to (i) agree final terms for the disposal of the site to deliver the scheme set out in the report, including the variation of any boundaries as required, in consultation with the Director of Housing Enterprise and Regeneration and (ii) instruct the Director of Legal Services to complete the necessary legal documentation

15.3 Reasons for Decision

15.3.1 The proposal now reported was identified as a priority in the Supported Housing Strategy 2012 -16 approved by Cabinet in February 2012 and in the Supported Housing Commissioning Plan approved by Cabinet in August 2009.

15.3.2 The allocation of grant from the HCA offers the opportunity to provide a purpose built scheme of up to 20 units of self contained accommodation together with the communal facilities.

15.3.3 The site at Richmond Park Drive is in a good location with access to local facilities and transport links to the City Centre. Of the sites available to the Council and Sanctuary for development, it offered the best location.

15.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

15.4.1 Development on privately-owned land

This option was given serious consideration and Sanctuary conducted a search for suitable private sector land. However, no sites were identified that were of a suitable size and location and available at an affordable price.

15.4.2 Development on other Council-owned sites

Officers considered a number of available Council sites. None of the alternative sites met all the criteria required.

15.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

15.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person and in all the circumstances the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

15.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Richard Webb, Executive Director, Communities.

15.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Safer and Stronger Communities.

Councillor
Chair,
Cabinet
1st March, 2013.