

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 20 September 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Bryan Lodge, Cate McDonald and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 The Chair, Councillor Julie Dore, reported that the Appendix to item 13 – ‘SCC to act as Accountable Body for Grant for the Connection of the E.ON District Energy Network to the SCC District Energy Network with Associated Funding Agreements and Heat Purchasing Agreement’ was not available to the public and press because it contained exempt information described in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person. Accordingly, if the contents of the Appendix were to be discussed at the meeting, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting at that point in the proceedings.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet, held on 19 July 2017, were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of Devolution

5.1.1 Nigel Slack asked what the Council’s future plans were in respect of the Devolution Deal? Would the Council work to stop the potentially costly election in May 2018? If the election of the Mayor went ahead, will that Mayor have a vote that could force Barnsley and Doncaster to accept the deal or is a unanimous vote by Constituent Councils required?

5.1.2 In response, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, commented that at the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority meeting on Monday 18 September she had asked for a letter from the Secretary of State to be read out which confirmed the current position. Following this two South Yorkshire authorities stated that they would not be proceeding with consultation on the Devolution Deal.

The Government had made it clear that there would be a South Yorkshire Mayor. So, if the City Region did not agree the Deal on offer, there would be a Mayor in place who would not have the powers that had previously been agreed. There was a need, therefore, to work closely with the Government to establish what powers the Elected Mayor would have. Councillor Dore would be working closely with the Government, the City Region and local businesses in Sheffield to progress the economic plans for Sheffield and the City Region.

5.2 Public Question in respect of the Old Town Hall

5.2.1 Nigel Slack commented that, following a conversation with a member of the 'Friends of the Old Town Hall', he understood that the money for the urgent repairs to the roof of the building had been received by the Council. What was the timescale for the repairs, with the onset of Autumn and the potentially damaging weather to come over the winter?

5.2.2 Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Business and Investment, responded that the Council had moved forward with the regeneration of Castlegate and the Old Town Hall was a part of that. The Council was looking to see how the money designated for this could be best used. The Council would be carrying out repairs on the Old Town Hall to ensure it was secure and vandal proof and the cost of this would be put on the property. It was hoped that this would be progressed as quickly as possible.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Hyperloop One Challenge

5.3.1 Nigel Slack stated that, along with local entrepreneur, Jonny Douglas, he had met with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability to discuss the lack of any Sheffield involvement in the Hyperloop One Challenge, despite 3 UK proposals reaching the semi-final stage. At that meeting it was agreed that we should at least be part of the conversation and the Cabinet Member tasked Creative Sheffield with contacting one of the bidding teams (London to Edinburgh) to begin that conversation with an invitation to the City and a visit to the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC).

5.3.2 Mr Slack added that today, 8 weeks later, he had finally seen an email that was proposed to be sent as an initial approach. The bid team involved was now already in the final with their proposal and would no doubt be inundated by such approaches. What can the Cabinet do to make sure we do not miss out on the chance to be in on this conversation and the potential good news for some supply chain investment in the City?

5.3.3 Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability, commented that, when he had met with Mr Slack, it had been agreed to wait until the outcome of the current stage which had only finished two weeks ago. The scheme was not the top priority for the Council. Councillor Scott was sceptical of the technology. This was not, however, a lack of ambition. It was about a clarity of focus and it was important to prioritise getting projects such as HS2 and HS3 right.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Review of Council Meetings

5.4.1 Nigel Slack commented that, in his view, the results of the Council Meetings Review had been mixed. In his opinion, the guillotining of public questions at the Full Council meeting was poorly handled and left many people with the impression of an intentional curtailing of public questions. The purpose of the review was commented on as aiming to make meetings more accessible for the public, this display seemed to contradict that aim. What were the next stages for the review and how could the public express their thoughts on the issue?

5.4.2 In response, Councillor Olivia Blake commented that, in reference to public questions, all public questions were allowed, the questioner concerned was making a statement rather than asking a question and had not come to the question despite being asked a number of times by the Lord Mayor. The Council was continually reviewing any changes made and were welcoming feedback. The Review Group had met once to review how successful the changes at the first meeting had been and would meet again shortly. There would be a survey on Citizenspace for the public to express their views.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Questions asked at a Scrutiny Meeting

5.5.1 Nigel Slack commented that, at the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee meeting on the 13th of this month, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene was in attendance to give an initial response to the Committee's report on the Western Road War Memorial and to take questions from the Committee Members.

5.5.2 Mr Slack submitted a number of questions to the Committee and specifically phrased them in a way that emphasised they were questions for the Committee. Mr Slack believed that the Chair could have asked those questions on his behalf. Instead the Chair chose to indicate that the questions would be replied to in writing which, considering the decision on the report was to be made today and answers in writing were taking weeks to be sent out, did not seem to make sense. Would the Cabinet Member therefore respond to Mr Slack's questions 1 and 4 from that meeting?

5.5.3 Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded that the questions Mr Slack had asked at the Scrutiny meeting had been of a technical nature and a technical report had been published in April on the Council's website. Members of the community could see the facts and the response of the Independent Tree Panel. Mr Slack's second question asked at the Scrutiny meeting would form part of today's meeting and the recommendations in the report.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Legal Injunction

5.6.1 Nigel Slack submitted a screenshot from Social Media which he said showed a person encouraging another member of the Sheffield Tree Action Group (STAG) to break the legal injunction which was in place which prevented protesters stopping lawful highway work. Would the Council be proceeding against this

individual for contempt of court?

5.6.2 Councillor Bryan Lodge commented that the Council will continue to monitor activities for any potential breaches of the Court Order. If people were in breach of this the Council would not hesitate to take action. Councillor Lodge would ask Legal Services to respond on the specific example submitted by Mr Slack.

5.7 Petition in respect of Sheffield Eagles and the Olympic Legacy Park

5.7.1 Graham Allan and Liz Efleet submitted a petition, containing 1033 signatures requesting that the Council grant permission for the Sheffield Eagles RLFC to play their matches at the Olympic Legacy Park. Mr Allan commented that, since the closure of the Don Valley stadium in 2013, the Eagles had had to play in four different venues, two of which were not in Sheffield. As a result, crowds had dropped from 1200 to 300.

5.7.2 Mr Allan added that this, along with a loss of sponsorship and other revenue streams, had put the Club in serious financial jeopardy and had had to raise £20,000 to stop the Club going out of business. Mr Allan had heard that the Park had been given to the Scarborough Group and questioned why this was, when Sheffield United FC already had two venues. He therefore sought assurances that the Eagles would be allowed to play at the Park.

5.7.3 Councillor Julie Dore commented that the Sheffield Eagles were very important to Sheffield, as all clubs were, and it was the wish of the Council to have a first class rugby club in Sheffield. The reasons for closing Don Valley Stadium were made clear at the time and, following the closure the Council needed to ensure that the land was put to good use for sporting activity as well as health and wellbeing use.

5.7.4 The land had not been handed over to the Scarborough Group. Discussions had been held with the Group, as they had been with the Sheffield Eagles. There was an Olympic Legacy Board who made decisions on the Council's behalf.

5.7.5 Councillor Mazher Iqbal added that he was involved in the discussions with the Sheffield Eagles when they had come forward with a developer and architect. However, due to the wish to purchase the recycling site, these did not move forward at that stage. The Olympic Legacy Board had made it clear that there would be a home for the Sheffield Eagles and also there would be women's football played, so there would be a lot of sporting activity at the Park.

5.7.6 Councillor Julie Dore commented that a wider discussion with the Eagles was needed which should involve Councillor Mazher Iqbal and Councillor Mary Lea. Councillor Iqbal would contact the petitioner in due course.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN/REFERRED FROM SCRUTINY

6.1 Western Road Scrutiny Working Group Report

6.1.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer submitted a report of the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee outlining

the findings of the Task and Finish Group in respect of the Western Road First World War Memorial and submitting recommendations to Cabinet.

- 6.1.2 Councillor Lodge thanked the Scrutiny Committee for the work they had done. He had carefully considered the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee, and had also taken into account the professional and objective analysis of the Council officers, which had been available on the Council's website for some time, and had concluded that these trees on the City's War Memorial streets deserved a final and further review before the Council made a final decision. Therefore, whilst he accepted the analysis of officers in relation to what was possible and could be funded within the contract, he had asked officers and Amey to review the options and additional costs of solutions that sat outside the PFI contract and to report back in due course. No felling, apart from any dangerous trees, would take place on these War Memorial streets until the further work was concluded.
- 6.1.3 Councillor Lodge stated that Officers had confirmed that two of the trees for replacement on Western Road were in a dangerous condition and therefore posed a threat to public safety. He added that these trees would have to be replaced and the public would expect the tree protestors to allow this important work to take place without hindrance.
- 6.1.4 Whilst Councillor Lodge was sure that this request for further work was the right approach, he needed to be honest with the residents by highlighting a number of issues that would be pertinent to any final decisions. For example, the funded engineering solutions within the PFI contract had been exhausted on all these trees, so any further options would require additional funding, which was potentially hundreds of thousands of pounds, and this could not be assumed to be available from the Council. Residents on these streets would need to be consulted about some of the alternatives to tree replacement.
- 6.1.5 In conclusion, Councillor Lodge stated that he had asked officers to assess further options, including the costs and impacts on residents. He hoped that the additional work would give assurance that the Council understood that these War Memorial trees were different from others in the City.
- 6.1.6 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-
- (a) thanks the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee for its work in relation to the Western Road First World War Memorial;
 - (b) notes the Western Road First World War Memorial Report that is attached as Appendix A to the report;
 - (c) notes that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene provided a verbal response to the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee's September 2017 meeting;
 - (d) agrees that a written report on progress on actions in response to the recommendations be provided to the Economic and Environmental

Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee for October 2017;

- (e) agrees that the Scrutiny Task and Finish Working Group report be shared with all members of Council, as requested by the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee; and
- (f) commissions Amey to carry out outline design work to identify solutions to retain as many highway trees on memorial streets as soon as possible to sufficient detail to enable an estimate of the additional funding needed to be provided to Cabinet.

6.1.7 Reasons for Decision

- 6.1.7.1 For expediency the Scrutiny Committee requested an initial response to their recommendations for September 2017, and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene provided a verbal update at the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee meeting on 13th September 2017.
- 6.1.7.2 In order to make it clear to the Scrutiny Committee what actions the Council is committing to, the Committee requests a formal written response report to its Western Road First World War Memorial Scrutiny Working Group Report by October 2017, within the Streets Ahead core investment period.
- 6.1.7.3 The Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee would like to share the report with all members of Council as an appropriate course of action, to close the circle on the referring of the petition to the Committee from Full Council.

6.1.8 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 6.1.8.1 An alternative option in relation to the recommendations would be to do nothing with the Task Group Report. However, given the time and effort spent by the Task Group and contributions to the work from residents and interested parties, and the expectations raised by the resolution of full Council in January 2017, this is not deemed a viable option.
- 6.1.8.2 An alternative option in relation to the recommendations would be to respond to the Committee's report over a much longer timescale. However, the Scrutiny Committee would welcome a fast response to its recommendations. The Committee believes an initial reporting to its September 2017 and a formal report to its October 2017 meetings strikes an appropriate balance between speed and allowing sufficient time for Cabinet Members and officers to consider the recommendations in the Western Road First World War Memorial Scrutiny Task and Finish Working Group's report, accommodating as far as possible the timeline of the Streets Ahead core investment period.

6.2 Frecheville WW2 Memorial Trees Petition

- 6.2.1 Cabinet considered a petition, containing 637 signatures, referred from the

Environmental and Economic Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee meeting held on 27 July 2017, requesting that the Council did not remove the trees planned for removal on Heathfield Road.

- 6.2.2 Mr Hinchcliffe and Mr Wallis attended the meeting to speak on the issue. They commented that, if the trees needed to be removed, they should all be replaced. They would expect the trees to be maintained and asked if the Council would allow the community to raise money to maintain them?
- 6.2.3 Councillor Bryan Lodge commented that he was aware of the history of the trees and why they were planted. An interpretation board had been erected to recognise this. It had been recognised that the trees needed to be replanted. A proposal had been to replace all 19 trees with an additional one to recognise those who had died serving the country.
- 6.2.4 Councillor Lodge added that this proposal had the support of local community groups. However, this had been in abeyance due to the Court injunction regarding the felling of trees. The proposal had been amended to now only replace the trees that were diseased. Although Councillor Lodge would like to replace all the trees that he believed needed to be replanted this was not possible. If the community wished to see all the trees replaced the Council could look at what was possible.
- 6.2.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene would continue to liaise with the petitioners as to future plans for the trees.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.
- 7.2 **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>Communities</u>		
Pauline White	Neighbourhood Support Officer	31
<u>People Services</u>		
Alice Batty	Primary School Assistant, St Wilfrid's Catholic Primary School	27
Susan Byrne	Teacher, Intake Primary School	21
Catherine Fitzsimmons	Teacher, Talbot Specialist School	41

Anne Giller	Housing Independence Commissioning Manager	29
Pat Grayhurst	School Manager, Stannington Infant School	21
Gillian Hewish	Teacher, Talbot Specialist School	26
Anita Riley	Teacher, Intake Primary School	29
Anne Rogers	Educational Psychologist	31
Philippa Rushforth	Teacher, Talbot Specialist School	26
Margaret Vaughan	Administration Manager, Birley Spa Primary Academy	31
Brenda Williams	Supervisory Assistant, Totley Primary School	20

Place

Peter Gait	Principal Planning Officer	42
David Nicholson	Team Leader, Streetforce	31
Ian Wright	Transport Maintenance Manager, Parking Services	34

Resources

Shona Cook	Personal Assistant to the Chief Executive	33
------------	--	----

(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. SOCIAL CARE RECOVERY AND IMPROVEMENT PLANS

- 8.1 The Executive Directors, Resources and People Services submitted a joint report
advising of the financial outlook for both Adult and Children's Social Care in
Sheffield against the budget available over the period of the medium term financial
strategy (up to 5 years)

8.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the challenges facing both Adults and Children's Social Care and the consequent impact on the Council's overall financial position;
- (b) approves the approach set out in the attached reports and that further work will take place as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan and 2018-19 budget;
- (c) requires the Cabinet Member for Finance, in conjunction with the Cabinet Members for Children, Young People and Families and Health and Social Care, to report back on further actions as part of the budget process; and
- (d) requests that the report be circulated to all local Members of Parliament with a request for a meeting to discuss how national funding issues can be raised with the Government.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

These are outlined in the report.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

None.

9. ADDING LIFE TO YEARS AND YEARS TO LIFE: DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT FOR SHEFFIELD 2017

9.1 The Director of Public Health submitted a report outlining the Annual Report of Public Health in Sheffield for 2017.

9.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report of the Director of Public Health and the recommendations it makes;
- (b) requests that the report be presented to full Council on 3 January 2018; and
- (c) agrees that the report be published on the Council's website.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

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. This year's report includes three such recommendations addressed to the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group. This year, the recommendations are based on areas for further research.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (including detailed health needs assessments) and an analysis of our performance against the 159 indicators that make up the national Public Health Outcomes Framework were used to identify the three main priorities for improving health and wellbeing in the local population and these formed the basis of the report accordingly.

10. SCC DIGITAL INCLUSION STRATEGY

10.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report presenting a Digital Inclusion Strategy for the Council and an accompanying action plan, setting out how the Council and its partners intend to tackle digital exclusion in the City.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the Digital Inclusion Strategy shown at Appendix 1 to the report as a statement of the Council's strategic approach to digital inclusion;
- (b) approves the accompanying Digital Inclusion Action Plan;
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Business Change and Information Solutions, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, to make amendments to the action plan on the basis of further development and consultation with stakeholders; and
- (d) notes that the implementation of any of the proposed actions may be subject to further decision making in accordance with the Leader's Scheme of Delegation.

10.3 Reasons for Decision

10.3.1 The introduction of a Digital Inclusion Strategy and action plan will provide the City with an opportunity to build on the excellent work that is already being done to improve the digital inclusiveness of its residents by organisations such as 'The Good Things Foundation', 'Heeley Development Trust', 'Barclays Digital Eagles' and in-house activity led by Council teams and Portfolios such as Lifelong Learning, Libraries and Children's Services.

10.3.2 The strategy is designed to recognise that whilst the Council cannot and does not have the resource to deliver against this agenda on its own, it is uniquely placed as a community and city leader to co-ordinate and provide the strategic leadership necessary to co-ordinate both existing and planned activity across the city. It also acknowledges that there is a need for greater links to be made at the strategic level e.g. with the Digital Skills Action Plan current development by Creative Sheffield.

10.3.3 Increasing the number of residents who are digitally active and included will have significant benefits from an economic and social perspective, as outlined in the strategy in Appendix 1 to the report.

10.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 10.4.1 The 'As-is' option: this would see no new strategy for digital inclusion adopted for the city. Much of the valuable work that currently takes place across the city to support people to access and benefit from using the internet would continue. However, the new opportunities for working together with Google Garage, Good Things Foundation, and businesses for example, to raise awareness of digital inclusion, provide digital skills training and target support more effectively would be lost. As would the potential to embed digital inclusion within the Council's approach to tackling wider social injustice such as fairness and financial inclusion.
- 10.4.2 Indeed the Council's Financial Social Inclusion Strategy makes specific mention of digital inclusion as an important enabler in addressing poverty and financial inclusion "local intelligence also points to digital exclusion being closely linked to financial exclusion".
- 10.4.3 No alternative options were therefore considered, however the Council's approach to digital inclusion should be seen in the context of the overarching digital agenda and the Council's ambitions and priorities in this area.

11. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2017/18 MONTH 3 AS AT 30/6/17

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the Quarter 1 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18.

11.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the 2017/18 Revenue Budget position; and
- (b) approves the request for revenue funding in Appendix 7 of the report.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

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.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

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.

12. MONTH 4 CAPITAL APPROVALS

12.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 04 2017/18.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1, including the procurement strategies and delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.

12.3.2 To formally record changes to 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.

12.3.3 To obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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.

13. SCC TO ACT AS ACCOUNTABLE BODY FOR GRANT FOR THE CONNECTION OF THE E.ON DISTRICT ENERGY NETWORK TO THE SCC DISTRICT ENERGY NETWORK, WITH ASSOCIATED FUNDING AGREEMENTS AND HEAT PURCHASE AGREEMENT.

13.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report requesting approval for the City Council to act as Accountable Body for grant for the connection of the E.ON district energy network to the SCC district energy network, with associated funding agreements and heat purchase agreement.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) approves the drawdown of the grant funding, totalling £2,231,250 (via a commercialisation grant for £417,500 and a construction grant for £1,813,750) from the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), via Salix (its agent), for commercialisation and construction of the connection between the E.ON Lower Don Valley (LDV) Heat Network and the SCC District Energy Network (DEN);

(b) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Place, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and Director of Legal and

Governance, to negotiate final terms and approve entry into:

- (i) back to back funding agreements for the commercialisation grant for £417,500 and for the construction grant for £1,813,750 with E.ON, with SCC acting as the Accountable Body for the funding; and
- (ii) a Heat Supply Agreement with E.ON for the purchase of a minimum of 7.5GWh of heat from E.ON's LDV Heat Network with the possibility for both the purchase of further heat beyond the initial 7.5GWh and the sale of heat from the Sheffield DEN to the E.ON LDV Heat Network; and
- (c) subject to the terms of any agreements with E.ON being approved by the Executive Director, Place in accordance with the delegation above, authorises the Head of Waste Management, to administer the grant agreements with BEIS and the agreements with E.ON in accordance with their terms.

13.3 Reasons for Decision

- 13.3.1 The grant funding through the Heat Networks Investment Project (HNIP) pilot is the only means of attracting the funding necessary to make the connection between the E.ON LDV Heat Network and the SCC DEN viable at this time.
- 13.3.2 This is a unique opportunity to use the grant funding that SCC has applied for to deliver a project with significant opportunities for Sheffield, and at minimal risk and cost to the Council. All funding agreements with E.ON seek to 'back off' and 'flow down' most risks, obligations and liabilities to E.ON. SCC will only draw down funding from HNIP when requested by E.ON and based on agreed milestones. The risk of any clawback is therefore minimal, but in any case that risk is also backed off to E.ON. SCC's only costs will be in administering the 'Accountable Body' role to pass HNIP funding through to E.ON who will deliver the project, but these costs will be covered by E.ON through a direct annual payment.

13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 13.4.1 The Business Case attached to the report show that the alternatives investigated involved either SCC funding the scheme's gap or E.ON fully funding the scheme, neither being commercially viable.
- 13.4.2 In the situation that the project was not funded, the SCC DEN would continue to rely on gas and oil boilers to provide back-up and top-up heat into the network at times of peak demand and during the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) shut-down periods.
- 13.4.3 The opportunities for carbon savings and air quality improvement would be lost and the SCC DEN would remain unable to achieve significant development and expansion.