

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 20 November 2013 by the Cabinet.

Date notified to all members: Friday 22 November 2013

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Thursday 28 November 2013

The decision can be implemented from Friday 29 November 2013

### **Item No**

#### **8. DISPOSAL OF SITES FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report recommending the disposal of a number of sites for affordable housing.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the land shown at Appendix A to the report be declared surplus to the requirements of the City Council and disposed to Arches Housing Limited at nil consideration for use as social housing;
- (b) the land shown as appendices B and C to the report be declared surplus to the requirements of the City Council and disposed to South Yorkshire Housing Association at nil consideration for use as social housing;
- (c) the decision made by Cabinet on 11 July 2007 to dispose of the land now shown as Appendix D to Places for People be rescinded and that the land shown as Appendix D to the report be disposed to Great Places Housing Group at nil consideration for use as social housing provided that there are no objections to the disposal of open space;
- (d) the land shown as Appendix E to the report be declared surplus to the requirements of the City Council and disposed to Great Places Housing Group at nil consideration for use as social housing provided that there were no objections to the disposal of open space;
- (e) the land shown as Appendix F to the report be declared surplus to the requirements of the City Council and disposed to Great Places Housing Group at nil consideration for use as social housing;
- (f) the land shown as Appendix G to the report be declared surplus to the requirements of the City Council and disposed to Pennine Housing 2000 at nil consideration for use as social housing;
- (g) the Director of Capital and Major Projects be authorised to negotiate and agree terms for the disposal of the sites for the purposes set out in the

report including the variation of any boundaries as required and to instruct the Director of Legal and Governance to complete the necessary legal documentation; and

- (h) dedicated affordable housing funding is paid into the Corporate Resource Pool in lieu of the estimated capital receipts forgone on the General Fund land (excluding the land shown at Appendices A and B).

### **8.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 8.3.1 Building housing at Catherine Street would regenerate this site in the heart of Burngreave, which was identified as a key intervention in the Burngreave and Fir Vale masterplan.
- 8.3.2 Developing the site at Chapelwood Road in Darnall would address a long term vacant site and provide affordable larger family homes that were particularly needed in the local area.
- 8.3.3 The proposed scheme at Hazelhurst and Chantrey in Jordanthorpe would build on the success of the existing White Willows Extra Care scheme and provide further older persons accommodation in an accessible location.
- 8.3.4 Developing an initial phase of affordable housing at the Adlington regeneration site would address the local need for affordable housing whilst also setting the quality standard for future phases of housing development.
- 8.3.5 The sites at Cricket Inn Road and Maltravers Way are both identified in the Wybourn, Arbourthorne and Manor Park Masterplan and their development would contribute significantly to the regeneration of the Wybourn estate, under the stewardship of Great Places.
- 8.3.6 The development of older persons housing at Sevenfields would meet a local need identified in the consultation that took place following the closure of Wisewood Secondary School. It would also contribute to the successful marketing of the Spider Park development site as agreed by Cabinet in May 2013.
- 8.3.7 The payment of dedicated affordable housing funding into the Corporate Resource Pool in lieu of capital receipts would ensure that the Council maintains maximum flexibility in the use of its resources.

### **8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

#### **8.4.1 Housing Revenue Account Sites**

The alternative options for the HRA sites would be:-

- (a) retain them for development of new Council housing, or
- (b) retain them for future disposal on the open market

- 8.4.2 Developing new Council housing on the HRA sites would have the advantage of retaining the assets whilst still delivering affordable housing. However, the HRA Business Plan does not currently have the capacity to deliver all of these sites –

and it would not be able to deliver them within a timescale that would guarantee New Homes Bonus. There are alternative sites that can be made available for new Council house building and, in order to maximise the amount of new affordable housing in the City, it is necessary to maximise investment from the Council, housing associations and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)>

8.4.3 Retaining the HRA sites for future disposal could realise capital receipts for reinvestment into either the existing housing stock or the development of new Council housing on other sites. However, the market value of the sites is relatively low, which means that the potential impact of capital receipts from the sites is outweighed by the strategic outcome of 100 new affordable homes on HRA land leveraging in £11m of external funding from the HCA and the housing associations, which would otherwise be lost to the City.

8.4.4 **General Fund Sites**

The alternative option for the General Fund sites would be to retain for disposal on the open market, thus releasing affordable housing funding to spend on other affordable housing projects. The effect on the Corporate Resource Pool would be neutral. However, there would be a negative effect on affordable housing delivery as many affordable homes without matching the Council's affordable housing funding investment from the HCA and the housing associations. Nor would there be certainty of immediate housing delivery with the associated economic benefits and New Homes Bonus payments.

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**

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

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

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

9. **SHEFFIELD LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the Flood Risk Management Strategy which aimed to reduce the likelihood of flooding and its impact on Sheffield's people, businesses and visitors, and also to take the opportunity to enhance the City's environment and seeking Cabinet approval for the Strategy.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) endorses the aims and objectives of the Sheffield Flood Risk Management Strategy, Edition 1, Version 1 (October 2013); and
- (b) approves the implementation of the action plan of measures outlined in Section 6 of the strategy document.

### 9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 places a statutory duty on Sheffield City Council as a Lead Local Flood Authority to prepare, implement and maintain a flood risk management strategy for its area.
- 9.3.2 The Sheffield Flood Risk Management Strategy is a partnership approach to managing flood risk with other agencies operating in the City. The strategy's aims are to reduce the likelihood of flooding and its impact on Sheffield's people, businesses and visitors whilst taking the opportunity to enhance the City's environment.

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

- 9.4.1 The City Council has chosen to develop an integrated flood risk management strategy working in partnership with the Environment Agency and Yorkshire Water. The approach covered the risk of flooding from the City's main rivers and streams as well as addressing surface water flooding.
- 9.4.2 Although the scope of the strategy went beyond the Council's specific legal duty to manage local flood risk, the Council was committed to working with the Environment Agency to address the main river flooding within the City.

### 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. **REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2013/14 (MONTH 5) AS AT 31/8/13**

- 10.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the month 5 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for

2013/14.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report on the 2013/14 budget position;
- (b) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
  - (i) approves the proposed variations and slippage in Appendix 1 including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or his nominated officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;
  - (ii) approves the acceptance of the grants in Appendix 2 of the report and notes the conditions and obligations attached to them;
  - (iii) notes the latest position on the Capital Programme including the current level of delivery and forecasting performance; and
  - (iv) notes the variations to approved project spend exercised by EMT and the appropriate Cabinet Member under delegated powers.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3. To formally record changes to the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with latest information.  
1

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4. A number of alternative courses of action were considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions were recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represented what Officers believed to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding was put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.  
1

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**

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Resources

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

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

11. **BUS RAPID TRANSIT NORTHERN ROUTE. FUNDING CONFIRMATION AND SCHEME CONSTRUCTION**

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Bus Rapid Transit Northern Route. The report sought authority to commence to construction, subject to the Department for Transport (DfT) decision regarding funding and the Council's approvals process, all of the highway infrastructure works within Sheffield in accordance with the agreed Principal Contractor's scheme of works.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) acknowledges and supports the progression of the BRT North scheme to full construction and authorise the completion of formal contracts with Carillion and North Midland to construct the necessary highway infrastructure within Sheffield, inclusive of the Tinsley Link Road, on terms satisfactory to the Director of Commercial Services or an officer nominated by him for this purpose;
- (b) accepts the grants from the DfT for £15.888m and ERDF for £8.1m funding on terms satisfactory to the Director of Regeneration and Development Services in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Finance;
- (c) authorises the Director of Regeneration and Development Services, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Finance, to take such further steps and to enter into such further agreements or arrangements, and on such terms, as he may consider appropriate to enable the successful delivery of the project within the approved budget.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 Officers have now completed all the necessary conditions of the DfT funding and as a consequence when the report was published were awaiting the decision from DfT on the initial estimate £15.4m of capital funding. This was granted but for an amount of £15.888m. This enabled the project to draw-down £8.1m of ERDF grant – following approval from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) for ERDF funding for the BRT North scheme.

11.3.2 A 'Key Stage Review' of the BRT North project was undertaken by senior City Council officers in July 2013. The review identified that the project had robust risk and project management processes in place and there was evidence that these were well managed and were being followed by all project partners. As such there was confidence in the successful delivery of BRT North and thus the Review recommended that the project proceeded to the next stage.

11.3. The scheme represented a high benefit to cost ratio and supported the Standing  
3 Up For Sheffield corporate objective of a Strong and Competitive Economy.

11.3. Once Full Approval from the Department for Transport was received, this will  
4 enable the drawdown of ERDF Funding – as it was a condition of the scheme receiving essential ERDF monies from DCLG.

**11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

11.4. The original proposal was to provide a tram link between Meadowhall and  
1 Rotherham. Instead Central Government recommended the partners look at Bus Rapid Transit instead.

11.4. The scheme partners have considered different routes and levels of service for the  
2 BRT North scheme before finalising on the recommended one. This decision was based on affordability and deliverability.

11.4. The ‘do nothing’ option was rejected as it would not enable achievement of the  
3 economic growth aspirations of the City (or wider Sheffield City Region) and would limit public transport accessibility in a key development corridor that currently experienced high level of congestion and poor air quality.

**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