

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 21 September 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Ben Curran, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Leigh Bramall, Bryan Lodge and Cate McDonald.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Ben Curran declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in agenda item 14 (see minute 13 below) 'Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector Grant Aid Funding 2017-18 Onwards' as a trustee of the Ben Centre. Councillor Curran left the room prior to consideration of the item and took no part in the discussion or vote.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 20 July 2016 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of Secret Meetings

5.1.1 Martin Brighton asked the following in relation to what he termed 'Secret Meetings':-

Subjects: Hate Crime and Hate Crime Scrutiny Panel, Community Safety, Housing Plus, Community Cohesion, Prevent Program and Prevent Working Group, Liaison with Equality Hubs, etc.

- Does this Council condone the use of secret meetings with respect to any of the above?

- Will the Council freely publish the remits, membership and minutes of all meetings, as indicated above?

5.1.2 The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) commented that the difficulty she had with Mr Brighton's question was what his definition of a secret meeting

was. There were meetings in confidential situations which needed to be held in private which could be to do with matters of this nature such as the meetings held with other agencies regarding the Prevent Strategy. Councillor Dore did not condone secret meetings being held which aimed to withhold information which was in the public interest.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Equality Hubs

5.2.1 Martin Brighton asked the following in relation to Equality Hubs:-

- What are the Council's criteria for defining success or failure of any Equality Hub?

- To what extent of intervention is the Council prepared to go to ensure that its definition of success of any hub is achieved?

5.2.2 In response, Councillor Jack Scott (Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries) commented that an away day had been arranged for the Equality Hubs on 14 October. The issue raised by Mr Brighton of what constituted a success or failure of an Equality Hub would be one of the key issues to be discussed on the day and Councillors and officers would work closely with the hubs to develop that answer.

5.2.3 Councillor Scott added that he was clear that the Council would take whatever steps necessary to ensure the success of hubs as they were far too important to be allowed to stall.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Funding

5.3.1 Martin Brighton asked from which budgets were the activities referred to in his previous question funded?

5.3.2 Councillor Jack Scott responded that activities were funded from the Policy, Performance and Communications budget. The Council was reviewing how they linked together so everyone was clear and a diagram was being developed which would set out the role of the groups, their expected impact and the governance structures.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Tenant Involvement

5.4.1 Martin Brighton asked the following in relation to tenant involvement:-

- From which budget is the money to pay for tenant involvement with the Association of Retained Council Housing (ARCH) activities taken?

- Were tenants afforded prior consultation and gave their consent before engagement with ARCH?

- Was any tenant attendee ascribed representative status been transparently elected by tenants?

- What is the purpose of engagement with ARCH?

5.4.2 In relation to the final question, Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing, commented that it was important to have tenant scrutiny as the Association was acting on behalf of the tenants not the Council. She would provide Mr Brighton with written answers to the rest of his questions.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Grant Funding

5.5.1 Martin Brighton asked, to aid transparency and accountability, will the Council publish the detail of all bids for grant funding, both successful and otherwise, accompanied by the reason for acceptance, or otherwise.

5.5.2 Councillor Jack Scott responded that this wouldn't be possible as it was against Council policy and would not be fair to the groups seeking council investment or who had suggested proprietary solutions.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Chinese Investment

5.6.1 Nigel Slack commented that there had been concerns expressed over the huge investment deal agreed with a prominent and politically well connected Chinese property company. He was pleased that the Council had agreed to be as open and transparent as possible over this deal, though that will probably not be transparent enough for Mr Slack as 'commercial confidentiality' was still well to the fore.

5.6.2 Mr Slack was, however, concerned over the spirit of the deal as well. When it was announced, the Council indicated that the investment would be used according to their plans for the City. In an article on BBC News- China Blog, however, the developer involved seemed to suggest that the initial plans 'he' had decided on were a 5 star hotel, luxury apartment blocks and a pastiche of a Greco-Roman classical fountain. He also appeared to have plans for the infrastructure of the City. Mr Slack therefore asked how can the public be certain that the sheer scale of this investment will not bias the planning process? In addition, with the Chinese Government being keen on overseas acquisitions, who will own the land and properties that this investment creates?

5.6.3 Councillor Julie Dore stated that she had not read the blog referred to by Mr Slack. The agreement with the Chinese investor was simple. The investor wished to invest in Sheffield on a number of projects. The investor would have his own ideas. However, the Council was in control of the plans for the City and any investor would have to comply with the particular outcomes of what the Council wanted to see in the City.

5.6.4 Any City would welcome a 5 star hotel being developed but it would need to be on the Council's terms and this was the same with apartment blocks. The investor had initially invested £220m in the City for a number of projects. The infrastructure was what would go along with these projects.

5.6.5 There were many opportunities in the City for investment and the City had the right kind of inclusive growth available. Ownership would depend on the individual project. Whatever was ultimately developed will be in the interests of the City. At the same time, the investor would want a return, so it would need to work for both parties.

5.7 Public Question in respect of Planning Design

5.7.1 Nigel Slack asked, with the University's 'Diamond' building coming in the top six contenders for "Carbuncle of the year", will the Council consider sending Planning Committee Members on a design aesthetics course or perhaps finish the Local Plan, before we become subject to similar unwanted accolades?

5.7.2 Councillor Julie Dore commented that beauty was in the eye of the beholder and what was good for one was not always good for another.

5.7.3 Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport) added that applicants chose their own architect. The City had its own Design Panel and the Council had its own in house design team. It was hoped that consultation on the Local Plan would take place early in the New Year.

5.8 Public Question in respect of City Region Growth Targets

5.8.1 Nigel Slack asked, with the Pound continuing to languish ever lower in the currency markets and most economic indicators dropping like stones, relatively speaking, will the Council be pushing the City Region to review the growth targets they will be committing themselves to before the devolution deal is finalised?

5.8.2 Councillor Julie Dore stated that the devolution deal was not dependent on growth targets. The City Region had infrastructure and transport plans and all were publically available or would be made available upon completion. The £30m a year the City Region would receive was not conditional on delivering growth targets and was focused on growing the economy.

5.8.3 Councillor Dore added that growth targets should always be reviewed in the light of the influence of external factors. In respect of economic indicators, the City Region was consulting with stakeholders over the vision for the Sheffield City Region.

5.9 Public Question in respect of Parking Permits

5.9.1 Nigel Slack stated that he had recently changed his car and this meant he had to replace his local parking permit to reflect the new vehicle. For Mr Slack this was a relatively painless task in the most part but, not only did the replacement cost £20 (almost 2/3rds of a full permit) but during the changeover and, whilst awaiting his new V5 from Swansea, he had to expend some 16 of his daily permits to remain legal. On the other end, his new permit did not reflect the time lost on his permit between advising the Council of the change of vehicle and the new permit being available. Mr Slack's new permit expired on the same day as the old one. Surely, Mr Slack therefore asked, it was not beyond the whit of man, having charged the

£20 replacement fee, to reflect the lost time on the new permit?

- 5.9.2 Councillor Mazher Iqbal commented that he would look into Mr Slack's issue and lessons would be learned. He also apologised to Mr Slack for the delay. A review of the cost of replacing permits had been undertaken in 2013 and it was concluded that the £5 charge was not sufficient to cover costs and that £20 would be more appropriate. There were plans to look at moving to a digital system in the future.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 The Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee submitted a report outlining the outcome of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 3 August 2016 where a Call-In on the decision of Cabinet at its meeting held on 20 July 2016 regarding Primary School Places in Ecclesall was considered.
- 6.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet notes the outcome of the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee meeting held on 3 August 2016 in relation to consideration of the Call-In regarding Primary School Places in Ecclesall to take no action in relation to the called-in decision.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

- 7.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources 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' Service</u>
<u>Children, Young People and Families</u>		
Janet Bowler	Teacher, Malin Bridge Primary School	20
Carol Dale	Education Psychologist	37
Patricia Daley	Education Psychologist	27
Sandra Flaherty	Residential Child Care Officer, Mossbrook Primary School	30
Eileen Kehoe	Team Manager	26
Raqia U-Din	Social Worker	32

Communities

David Allen	Support Worker	31
Karen Fox	Support Worker	34
Jacqueline Lomas	Support Worker	34
Diane O'Brien	Support Worker	24
Anne Seaton	Support Worker	29

(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. NEW BANNERDALE SECONDARY SCHOOL UPDATE

8.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report updating Cabinet on plans for a new secondary school on the Bannerdale site and seeking approval to vary the location of the build reported to Cabinet in February 2016.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with the Cabinet decision of 17th February 2016, to reiterate its approval for the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families to take all necessary steps to open a new school on part of the Bannerdale site and to note the option described in the report to locate the new school buildings to the western side of the access road as the current preferred option, subject to the formal planning application process.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 The proposal to create the school buildings on the western side of the access road is the option most likely to meet the overall vision for the school and the site. It allows for the best possible layout and design for the school buildings; it ensures that capital is targeted at the school building and site, rather than ameliorating the ground conditions; it allows a design that is sympathetic to the park setting and supports easy access to the pitches for both the school and community; and it allows for a better parking and drop-off arrangement to take traffic away from local roads.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 The main alternative location for the building would be the former car park area or the former Bannerdale centre site area that is now earmarked for housing. The report outlines the reasons for a move away from the former car park area. The Bannerdale centre site area was part of the February Cabinet decision that reaffirmed the Council's commitment to providing a site for housing and realising

the capital receipt.

9. YOUNG PEOPLE'S SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICE

9.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report setting out the need for the young people's substance misuse service, which is coming to the end of a 4 year commissioning cycle. The proposal is to recommission for 2+1 years from April 2017 on a tapered budget. The proposed changes to the specification are in response to the stakeholder consultation and to adapt to changes in profile and the developments within children's services.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) approval is given to retender the Young People's Substance Misuse Service 2013 - 2017 for 2 years, with an optional one year extension period;
- (b) approval is given to a reduction in contract value to reflect the reducing Public Health Grant and reductions made previously to other contracts;
- (c) approval is given to the proposed changes to the service specification set out in bullet points within the report at section 6 - Reasons for Recommendations;
- (d) authority be delegated to the Director of Commercial Services to approve the procurement strategy for the tender for the Young People's Substance Misuse Service 2017-2019; and
- (e) authority be delegated to the Director of Commercial Services to agree contract terms and approve a contract award following the tender process.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The service will be a delivery partner for the development of a Youth Information Advice and Counselling Service (YIACS) model at Star House, led by Sheffield Futures and building on the co-location of services to provide a co-ordinated one stop shop for young people with access to substance misuse assessment and treatment as part of a wider offer of health and wellbeing needs.

The substance misuse service will also be involved in delivery of targeted youth support through the development of a broader youth offer. Whilst the integration of drugs workers into the Youth Justice Service and Community Youth Teams remains an effective model to target need, and provide flexibility to respond to the demand of universal access through YIACS, the youth offer requires the referral pathway to be direct to the provider from a range of referring partners, and for resources to be mobile in response to need.

As Public Health funding diminishes, commissioners are responding with innovative partnerships between public, voluntary and private sector partners to continue to meet the needs of vulnerable young people.

Following consultation with the incumbent provider, referring partner agencies and service users, the following changes are proposed within the new service specification:

- Staff located in services are integrated into the developing YIACS (Youth Information Advice and Counselling Service) model and aligned to the broader youth offer
- Development support for families of young people who misuse substances through a whole family approach
- Development of specialist support for young people involved in gangs

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 The alternative to commissioning a substance misuse service for children and young people would be to have universal GP (Tier 1) and hospital treatment (Tier 4) with no specialist community provision (Tier 2 and 3). Schools and organisations working with vulnerable young people, including children in care, would need to draw on their own resources to meet the needs of this cohort of young people without the benefit of targeted specialist resources to support their needs through workforce development and capacity building training, and providing interventions to young people.

9.4.2 If the decision was not to recommission the young people's substance misuse service, it is likely that vulnerable young people with substance misuse as part of a range of needs would be more likely to be excluded from school and enter the criminal justice system. This would contribute to an increase in risk, vulnerability and poor life outcomes and potentially impact on community safety and cohesion.

10. **A MATTER OF LIFE AND HEALTHY LIFE - DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT FOR SHEFFIELD 2016**

10.1 The Director of Public Health submitted his annual report. Directors of Public Health have a statutory duty to produce an annual report on the health of the local population and to make recommendations as to how local health may be improved. This year's report makes four such recommendations, three of which are addressed to the Council (among others). The report is due to be presented to full Council on 5th October 2016 and Cabinet is asked to seek any clarification on the topics, issues and recommendations raised in it.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet endorses the recommendations within the annual report, that:-

- (a) **The Health and Wellbeing Board** should take forward a series of learning events / appreciative enquiry on different approaches to health and wellbeing to explore what optimising "health and wellbeing" could look like in a number of key policy areas.
- (b) **The Council and other stakeholders**, as part of Public Sector Reform,

should consider a healthy population and minimising health inequalities as a core infrastructure investment for a prosperous economy.

- (c) **The Council and the CCG** should explore the development of a 'Heart of Sheffield' structural model to coordinate and shape a policy approach to improving living well options (such as increasing physical activity and reducing smoking) in the City.
- (d) **The Council and the CCG** should develop a joint neighbourhood delivery system with a broad model of primary care as the main delivery mechanism for services.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 It is good practice for DPH reports to contain recommendations aimed at improving the health of the local population, addressed to a number of partners and stakeholders as required.
- 10.3.2 In addition it should also report on progress made on the recommendations from the previous year's report. Appendix A to this paper provides a progress report on the three DPH report recommendations from 2015.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 There were no alternative options presented in the report.

11. **SHEFFIELD ALCOHOL STRATEGY 2015-2020**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report setting out the work undertaken by Sheffield Drug and Alcohol Co-ordination Team (DACT) to develop a new alcohol strategy for Sheffield covering the period from October 2016-October 2020 – a four year strategy.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the content of this report is noted and approval is given to the Sheffield Alcohol Strategy 2016-2020;
- (b) the Director of Commissioning be authorised to terminate contracts relevant to the delivery of the strategy and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contracts;
- (c) in accordance with the high level commissioning strategy and this report, authority be delegated to the Director of Commissioning to:
 - in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, the Director of Commercial Services and the Director of Public Health, approve the procurement strategy for any service delivery during the period of the strategy;

- in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, the Director of Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, award, vary or extend contracts for the provision of services procured in implementation of the strategy; and
 - in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Commercial Services, make awards of grants; and
- (d) the Director of Commissioning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, the Director of Public Health, the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Commercial Services, is authorised to take such other steps as he deems appropriate to achieve the outcomes in the report.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

- 11.3.1 The strategy has been written based on robust local and national evidence.
- 11.3.2 The strategy has been widely consulted on, both before and after the first version was written – it has been inputted to by a vast range of agencies and professionals who have an expertise in alcohol related treatment and issues.
- 11.3.3 The strategy aims to reduce the harms caused by alcohol use and misuse, normalise the conversation about alcohol, intervene earlier raising awareness and preventing problems occurring and catching them early when they do, as well as ensuring those with a need for alcohol treatment can access treatment without barriers and have a high chance of achieving a sustainable outcome.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 11.4.1 The 'do nothing' option would be to not have any form of alcohol strategy in place. However, Sheffield has had a strategy in place since 2007 that has guided the direction and work done to address alcohol use and misuse. Therefore not having a strategy would not support this approach.
- 11.4.2 Refreshing the 2010-2014 strategy – this would have been a shorter piece of work, however, the former strategy had a lot of focus on the night time economy and, whilst this is relevant and a lot was achieved during the last period of work, there have been a lot of changes since 2010 and areas on which the strategy needs to focus, so a new strategy was appraised as the most appropriate option.

12. SHEFFIELD ADVOCACY HUB

- 12.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report seeking approval to proceed with the development, procurement and implementation of the "Sheffield Advocacy Hub".

12.2 It was reported that there was an error in the report and all references to the “Sheffield Mental Health Advocacy service” should instead read “Sheffield Citizens Advice and Law Centre”.

12.3 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) from April 2017, Sheffield City Council (SCC) commissions a comprehensive, integrated advocacy service using a “Hub” format as described in the report; the new service to be known as “The Sheffield Advocacy Hub”;
- (b) the authority to initiate the tender process and award the contract to the most suitable bidder for a period of 5 years, is delegated to the Director of Commissioning;
- (c) the necessary funding is transferred from existing budgets into a new single business unit to facilitate payment processes and forecasting in time for the start of the new arrangements; the total funding over 5 years is estimated to be £4,465,695; and
- (d) the existing advocacy contracts are terminated in line with their notice periods from the date the new arrangement starts.

12.4 **Reasons for Decision**

12.4.1 A paper to Communities JLT in 2015 initiated a series of consultations culminating in an options appraisal which strongly recommended that a “Hub” model is developed using a “cost and volume” contract. Details are included in Appendix 1 of the report but the main arguments in favour of the Hub model are:

- A single, easily accessed point of contact
- More effective and easier communication
- Consistent standards
- Economies of scale including lower back-office costs
- Capacity is consolidated; best practice can be shared
- More efficient use of statutory advocacy hours coupled with a more robust system of sign-posting to alternative sources of support.

The main arguments supporting a Cost and Volume approach are:

- The block element offers some assurance for providers and allows up-front investment in training and development.
- Allows flexibility for purchaser above the minimum levels

12.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.5.1 A range of alternative options for contract and payment structure were considered.

Contract Structure

Individual contracts for each type of advocacy
Framework contract
Single Provider delivering all services
Hub Model – PREFERRED OPTION

12.5.2 Payment model

Block contract- fixed payments based on forecast activity
Spot purchase - all advocacy bought on a case buy cases basis at a tendered hourly rate
Cost and Volume – (block plus spot) – PREFERRED OPTION

13. VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH SECTOR GRANT AID FUNDING 2017-18 ONWARDS

13.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report seeking approval for a new three-year grant funding strategy for Sheffield's voluntary, community and faith (VCF) sector from the Council's corporate grant aid budget for the period 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2020. The strategy will replace the current corporate grant aid arrangements which operate an annual cycle of grant awards.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet, 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 within those provisions, endorses a three-year year grant funding strategy for Sheffield's voluntary, community and faith (VCF) sector from the Council's corporate grant aid budget for the period 2017 to 2020, as described in the report.

In particular Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the grant aid budget and grant fund structure for 2017-2020 as detailed at paragraph 4 and contained in Appendix 3 and Table 1 (para 4.1) of the report, and notes that:-
 - (i) whilst the total grant aid budget is subject to approval by full Council each financial year, the Executive Director, Resources has advised that a minimum figure can be guaranteed for the subsequent budgets in years 2 and 3 based on 80% and 75% respectively of the total budget in year 1; and
 - (ii) the actual budgets in years 2 and 3 will depend on what is agreed at full Council at the annual budget discussions, so may be more but not less than the guaranteed minimum up to a maximum of 100% of the award;
- (b) agrees the principle of offering three-year grant awards for all successful grant applicants as standard, offered on the basis that in years 2 and 3

grant recipients are guaranteed a minimum of 80% and 75% of the value of the initial award in year 1, and notes that:-

- (i) an exception to this proposal are the grant awards made from the Lunch Club Fund, which will be awarded for 2 years as it is proposed that this funding will be reviewed during 2018-19;
 - (ii) in all cases, the relevant delegated decision maker will retain the discretion to award single year grants or multi-year grants of less than 3 years if circumstances warrant it and there is a clear rationale for doing so; and
 - (iii) the actual value of the grant awards in years 2 and 3 of any multi-year agreements will depend on what is agreed at full Council. If the Grant Aid budget in years 2 and 3 allows for awards of more than the guaranteed minimum, an increase to the award will be automatically applied equally (in % terms) across all existing multi-year agreement recipients;
- (c) approves the list of organisations prioritised for a Core Service Grant to start from April 2017 as detailed in Appendix 4, and the process for agreeing the value and length of each grant funding agreement;
 - (d) agrees a minimum and maximum range of £850,000 to £876,000 for the value of the strategic Core Service Grant to Sheffield Citizen's Advice, included in Appendix 3 and delegates authority to the Executive Director, Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, to enable them to exercise their discretion, within the range, to agree actual grant award value to start from April 2017;
 - (e) approves the proposals at section 1.4 of the report, to establish and deliver two new open grant funds – the Infrastructure Grant Fund of circa £190,000 and the Tackling Inequalities Fund of circa £107,674, and their eligibility criteria detailed in Appendix 5;
 - (f) approves the proposals outlined at section 1.8 and Appendix 6 of the report, to establish and deliver the Lunch Club Fund totalling £189,000, which combines financial support to individual lunch clubs and infrastructure support specific to lunch club development, with a review of this funding pot during 2018-19 in order to consider how this funding could better support the outcomes of the People Keeping Well in their Community Partnerships within the City;
 - (g) approves the proposals at paragraph 1.5.10 of the report, to establish a Grant Recommendation Panel, who will consider appropriately delegated officer assessments of applications to all open Grant Funds within the new Grand Aid structure and to make recommendations to the relevant decision maker for individual grant awards;
 - (h) agrees to transfer £14,000 from the Grant Aid budget permanently to the

City Centre Management team to commission a mobility scheme for the city centre;

- (i) agrees to transfer £30,000 from the Grant Aid budget permanently to the Head of Libraries and Community Services to support the delivery of community cohesion work;
- (j) authorises the Executive Director, Communities to agree, in consultation with Legal Services, the terms of any funding agreements or other agreements entered into by the Council in relation to awards from the new Fund;
- (k) takes specific note of a shift in the decision making route of individual grant awards from the Grant Aid budget which will apply until 2020, as follows. Previously the Leader's Scheme of Delegation was not used and Cabinet approved all awards over £20,000. To progress with applications and awards in a timely manner and for continuity of funding arrangements where it is needed, the decision making routes for all grant awards made from the Grant Aid budget will default to adhering to the relevant delegations outlined in the Leader's Scheme;

In short, this means:

- the Executive Director, Communities has the delegated authority to decide all grant awards from the Grant Aid budget up to the value of £49,999, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries;
- the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries has the delegated authority to decide all grant awards from the Grant Aid budget of over £50,000;

When making grant award decisions, the appropriate decision maker will adhere to all relevant grant processes agreed in this report and act in accordance with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation;

For multi-year agreements, the grant value levels above apply to the total maximum amount that could be awarded over the length of the grant agreement. For example, if an award is £10,000 for one year and the agreement is for 3 years the total maximum value of the award would be £30,000;

The delegations outlined in the Leader's Scheme also apply when agreeing the amounts, purposes and recipients of any individual grants awarded from the grant aid budget during 2017-18 to 2019-20, including any additional sums received or returned or unpaid grants. They also apply when considering the withdrawal of grants where (a) a change of circumstance affects the ability of an organisation to deliver the purpose of the grant awarded or (b) the relevant decision maker 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;

- (l) (i) agrees the indicative figures for each of the new grant aid funds, noting that as the grants awarded from each fund are finalised, as per timetable, in paragraph 1.4.2 of the report, this will affect the amount of funding available for the Tackling Inequalities and Better Health & Wellbeing Fund and the remaining money will become that fund, and (ii) authorises the delegation of allocating available money in the open fund to the Executive Director of Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, using the Recommendation Panel as appropriate and in line with authorisation limits; and
- (m) notes that, for the three-year period that this strategy applies, the Equality and Fairness Grants and the BME Older People's Fund will be administered using the grant process proposed in this paper but budgets will still be held by the current budget holders.

13.3 Reasons for Decision

- 13.3.1 The proposed grant aid structure of a mixture of invites and advertised funds allows the Council to ask prioritised groups to come forward with ideas for how they could use a 3-year grant award to continue and develop their services and the benefits to Sheffield people; as well as giving an opportunity for new ideas or groups not funded before to come forward with ideas that they believe will have a positive impact for Sheffield people.
- 13.3.2 The priorities link to the Corporate Plan outcomes, and emphasis on demonstrating impact in the application forms and monitoring will help assure value for money.

13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 13.4.1 The current grants regime has been running since 2012. Since then there has been a new corporate plan and the context that public services, including the voluntary sector, operates in has been changing. There is a desire to open up opportunities for different groups to offer their ideas and support them with grant aid.
- 13.4.2 The Council could have run an entirely advertised pot. However, there are some groups that strategically it makes sense to continue to support with grant aid because of their links to council services and corporate outcomes. It is preferable for the Council to be clear about intentions in this regard rather than have an entirely advertised pot.
- 13.4.3 The Council could have run an entirely invite pot. However, this would have excluded new organisations and / or new ideas for the grant aid fund.
- 13.4.4 The consultation has helped to refine the proposals. The responses to the consultation have given a steer to the following decisions:

- Agreements will be for 3-years, unless a sound reason for them to be shorter.
- If a fund is over-subscribed, then rather than splitting money across multiple organisations, the strongest applications will be awarded the full amount asked for.
- Have a VCF representative on Recommendation Panels where no conflict of interest is presented.
- The priorities for the infrastructure fund were broadly even, so infrastructure organisations will be asked to consider how best to meet all four priorities.
- The fund will be prioritised for work with the most vulnerable and marginalised groups in the city.
- Organisations previously receiving money from this fund can still apply.
- Feedback will inform how outcome measures are agreed with successful applicants.

**14. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2016/17
MONTH 3 AS AT 30 JUNE 2016**

14.1 The Acting Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the Month 3 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme as at 30 June 2016.

14.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the 2016/17 Revenue Budget position;
- (b) approves the additional funding required to support the implementation of the Refine project; and
- (c) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
 - (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 6.1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;
 - (ii) approves the proposed variations, deletions and slippage in Appendix 6.1 of the report; and
 - (iii) notes the variations authorised by Directors under the delegated authority provisions and the latest position on the Capital Programme.

14.3 Reasons for Decision

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

14.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 14.4.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.