

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 16 January 2019

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Olivia Blake, Lewis Dagnall, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Chris Peace, Jack Scott and Jim Steinke

.....

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 Appendix 2 of the report at item 12 (Month 8 Capital Approvals) was not available to the public and press because it contained exempt information described in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime. Accordingly, if the content of the appendix was to be discussed, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Olivia Blake declared a personal interest in agenda item 9 'The Enhanced Supported Living Framework' (see minute 8 below) as a Non-Executive Director of the Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust.

3.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall declared a personal interest in agenda item 9 'The Enhanced Supported Living Framework' (see minute 8 below) as the partner of a Non-Executive Director of the Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 12 December 2018 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Petition in respect of Ward Pots

5.1.1 Andrew Woodhead presented a petition, containing 14 signatures, regarding the process for allocation of Ward Pots. As a representative of the Hanover Tenants Association the Group had applied for funding on 5 September. An acknowledgement email had been sent on 17 October confirming that the funding would be sent within 12 weeks. The email also stated that the funding needed to be spent by March 2019. Since then the Association had heard nothing. Mr Woodhead had also spoken to members of the Broomhill Tenants and Residents

Association who had applied for funding in August 2018 but had not received a response from the Authority.

- 5.1.2 In Mr Woodhead's opinion the process was not good enough as the Association needed to plan ahead and they couldn't do that without the guarantee of funding. He requested that the Cabinet look into how the Ward Pot was administered. The Association had received an email the day after Mr Woodhead had submitted the petition to the Authority, which stated that the funding would be granted. Mr Woodhead also had concerns about this email as it also mentioned another Group who had been allocated funding which he was not aware of and this may raise issues in respect of General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
- 5.1.3 The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, commented that she was pleased to hear that the funding application had now been resolved but was concerned about the issues raised.
- 5.1.4 Councillor Jim Steinke, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, thanked Mr Woodhead for the petition. He appreciated the patience of the Association but acknowledged that this situation was not good enough. He commented that there had been pressure on officers in the grants team due to sick leave but accepted that there needed to be a way of accommodating sick leave for officers which did not have an impact on grant applications.
- 5.1.5 A process needed to be established for funding in due course as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would allocate more funding to communities than Ward Pots had. Councillor Steinke acknowledged that the Ward Pot system had been an unsatisfactory system in the past and meetings had been arranged with Ward Councillors to try and resolve that.
- 5.1.6 Councillor Dore added that she was sure that Mr Woodhead would be consulted on any review of community group funding. However, it was important to bear in mind Government budget cuts, particularly as the former Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Eric Pickles M.P., often viewed staff in community services within Local Government as dispensable 'back office staff' but this impacted on the administration of community grants.

5.2 Public Question in respect of the Sheffield Retail Quarter

- 5.2.1 Nigel Slack commented that in the Capital Approvals report, on the agenda for this meeting, reference was made on page 117 of the summary Appendix 1 to slippage on the budget for the Sheffield Retail Quarter of £2m. Mr Slack could understand how the welcome change to Heart of the City 2 developments on a block by block basis might cause slippage on individual block budgets, but could the Council give more detail on the what and why there was slippage on the cost of office facilities?
- 5.2.2 Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Business and Investment, responded that the slippage Mr Slack referred to was needed as there was a need for a budget to appoint agents for the market and other essentials. The Council was still marketing the properties at the moment and the budget was a resource

for tenants who took on any properties.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Community Organisations

5.3.1 Nigel Slack asked when was the last occasion that a proposal from a community organisation to acquire either ownership or use of a Council property was successful? How many such proposals have been successful since 2010? Have the Council perceived any pattern to those proposals that were unsuccessful and whether this would suggest a need to review the process?

5.3.2 Councillor Olivia Blake, Cabinet Member for Finance, stated that the Council worked in partnership with a number of community organisations. The Council took a flexible approach as no one model would work for all. The Council had a number of short and long term lease arrangements in respect of community buildings. The Council needed to be certain that it was not placing groups in positions where they were not able to continue in the long term if their business plan was not viable. This was an easy process for the Council to determine. The Council was supporting groups to ensure that their business plans were viable.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Community Groups

5.4.1 Nigel Slack asked was it normal practice for community organisations that received funding from the Council to be required or expected to provide advance copy of any publications they may produce?

5.4.2 Councillor Jim Steinke commented that he would provide a written answer to Mr Slack but it was not normal practice in the way Mr Slack had stated. If something sensitive was being produced it was common sense for the Council to ask to look at that. If there was a specific case that Mr Slack was aware of he should let Councillor Steinke know.

5.5 Public Question in respect of the Greenest City

5.5.1 David Dilner circulated a survey in respect of green space within cities which ranked Sheffield as sixth in respect of green space. He therefore asked if the Cabinet could agree that Sheffield was not the UK's greenest city?

5.5.2 Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure, commented that a satellite image taken a few years ago had shown that Sheffield was the UK's greenest city. There was a national park within the City and a number of other green features. Efforts had been made to reduce the carbon footprint in the City. High environmental standards were demanded from developers. There were high recycling rates in the City. However, the Council will never be complacent on this issue.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Legal Advice

5.6.1 David Dilner asked was the Council entirely satisfied with the advice of the Legal and Governance department to date in the matter of the ongoing S.T.A.G campaign?

5.6.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, commented that he was satisfied with the advice he had received from the Legal and Governance department. The Council had not taken advice against S.T.A.G as a corporate entity. S.T.A.G had distanced itself from the action that the Council had taken legal action on. The Council supported peaceful protest but lawful work must be allowed to take place.

5.7 Public Question in respect of Streets Ahead Core Investment Period

5.7.1 Justin Buxton referred to a response given by Councillor Lewis Dagnall at the Full Council meeting on 10 January in respect of the Streets Ahead Core Investment Period and asked for clarification on the circumstances and whether the Core Investment Period had been subject to any variation and therefore hadn't been completed on time?

5.7.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall confirmed that the Core Investment Period had been completed on time and he would send a written response to Mr Buxton with more detail.

5.8 Public Question in respect of Tree Replacement

5.8.1 Justin Buxton referred to the tree that had been replaced at Chatsworth by the replacement of kerbs which had been previously marked for felling and therefore asked had the City Council been less than truthful in stating that the felling of trees was a last resort?

5.8.2 Councillor Dagnall commented that the City Council was always truthful and had consulted in respect of the retention of trees. He had asked for a halt on tree felling to try and agree a compromise on all sides. Amey had provided additional funding to try and prevent more trees from being felled.

5.9 Public Question in respect of Tree Felling

5.9.1 Justin Buxton commented that the Council often quoted the figure of 10,000 trees which needed to be replaced under the Streets Ahead contract. If the Tree Management Programme was not signed off by the Council would they be fining Amey as a result?

5.9.2 Councillor Dagnall responded that he would reply to the question in writing and the question had been answered in discussions with S.T.A.G representatives.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

6.1 There had been no items called-in for Scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

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>People Services</u>		
Timothy Marsden	Social Worker, Level 2	35
Lindsey Savage	Business Manager, Children and Families	38
<u>Resources</u>		
Barbara Howson	Senior Customer Service Advisor	32

(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. THE ENHANCED SUPPORTED LIVING FRAMEWORK

8.1 The Executive Director, People Services submitted a report proposing the provision of an Enhanced Supported Living Framework for people with a learning disability and/or autism who display behaviour that challenges.

8.2 It was reported that there was an error in the front sheet of the report and the relevant Cabinet Member was the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and not the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care.

8.3 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) approves the provision of supported living services for people with a learning disability and/or autism who display behaviour that challenges ("Enhanced Supported Living Services") in order to provide positive outcomes and sustainable quality at best value for the people of Sheffield;

(b) delegates authority to the Director of Adult Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance:

(i) to decide the procurement strategy for Enhanced Supported Living Services;

- (ii) to negotiate and agree the invitation to tender documentation including the terms of the framework contract and any call-off contracts in respect of the Enhanced Supported Living Services;
 - (iii) to award the framework contracts to the successful services providers chosen by the Council; and
 - (iv) to take all other necessary steps not covered by existing delegations to achieve the outcomes outlined in the report; and
- (c) notes that the Council may call off services from the Enhanced Supported Living Services framework on behalf of Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) as described in paragraph 1.20 of the report; and delegates authority to the Director of Adult Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, to approve the terms of the arrangement with Sheffield CCG and also take all other necessary steps in order to minimise the Council's risks in such arrangement.

8.4 Reasons for Decision

8.4.1 There is a gap in the local market for community-based support for people with learning disabilities and/or autism who display behaviours that challenge. Without an Enhanced Supported Living Framework we would:-

- continue to rely on residential care options, including out of city services, which would limit individual choice and outcomes and can be more costly than Supported Living, and
- be limited to the regional enhanced community living framework for supported living options.

8.4.2 The proposed local Enhanced Supported Living Framework will also:-

- provide new options for children and young people who display behaviours that challenge to have local community-based support
- enable strong local partnership working with selected providers to continually develop and improve
- enable robust local monitoring of the quality of support for highly vulnerable individuals
- facilitate transition from Enhanced to standard Supported Living services

8.4.3 The proposed local Enhanced Supported Living Framework will allow Sheffield to secure good quality, resilient community-based support that guarantees best value for the city.

8.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.5.1 Option 1 – Regional Care Options

Without an Enhanced Supported Living Framework, we would:-

- continue to rely on residential care options, which would limit individual choice and outcomes and can be more costly than Supported Living
- be limited to the regional enhanced community living framework for supported living options

8.5.2 Option 2 – Regional framework

We have appraised the option of using only the regional enhanced community living framework and consider there are significant benefits in having our own local enhanced framework.

The Regional framework focuses exclusively on the Transforming Care cohort, whereas a local framework can be wider i.e. include prevention, return from out of city residential care, help with transition and other complex needs.

A local framework

- will facilitate smoother transition from an enhanced service to the standard framework where the same organisation provides both
- will allow small local organisations with local community-based networks who do not wish to bid to be on the wider regional framework to support people who display behaviours that challenge
- can be re-opened at our discretion, offering more local control over the market
- allow closer control over price
- builds on the local framework and relationships
- builds on success of local standard framework

9. FURNISHED ACCOMMODATION PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking to obtain permission for Sheffield City Council to tender for, and award contracts for the provision of furnished accommodation goods under a fully Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and OJEU compliant Framework. The existing contract is due to end in January 2019 and it is intended that a waiver be sought to extend this contract for a period of 10 weeks so that a full procurement and contract award process can be completed, whilst maintaining the service provision and our contractual obligations.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) agrees that services be procured via a Framework Agreement for the supply of furnished goods as detailed and outlined within the report; and
- (b) delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, in consultation with the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods, to award such contract and take such other necessary steps not covered by existing delegations to achieve the outcomes outlined in the report.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 The reasons for recommending this business are highlighted in the summary of benefits at section 2 of the report.

9.3.2 The successful tender and contract awards will benefit vulnerable residents of the city and offer opportunities to develop the Furnished Accommodation Service with other Local Authorities and Registered Social Landlords

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 N/A

10. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN AND HRA BUDGET 2019/20**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report providing the 2019/20 update of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan. It includes proposals to:

- Take a proactive approach to managing our neighbourhoods and supporting our tenants
- Prioritise investment in fire safety measures
- Continue to deliver improvements to our tenants' homes to make sure they continue to be well maintained over the next 5 years
- Keep costs under control and explore HRA savings with the aim of getting better value for money on contracts and paying for the services we use
- Accelerate the council housing new build programme and maximise the use of HRA flexibilities to further increase the provision of new homes

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 6 February 2019 that:

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2019/20, as set out in the appendix to the report, is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2019/20, as set out in the appendix to the report, is approved;

- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2019 in line with requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites will remain unchanged for 2019/20;
- (e) the community heating standing charge will increase by 20p per week for 2019/20;
- (f) the sheltered housing service charge will remain unchanged for 2019/20;
- (g) burglar alarm charges will remain unchanged for 2019/20; and
- (h) service charges for furnished accommodation will remain unchanged for 2019/20.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 To optimise the number of good quality affordable Council homes in the city.
- 10.3.2 To maximise the financial resources to deliver key outcomes for tenants and the city in the context of a self-financing funding regime.
- 10.3.3 To ensure that tenants' homes continue to be well maintained and to optimise investment in estates.
- 10.3.4 To assure the long term sustainability of Council housing in Sheffield.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 Sheffield City Council has a statutory duty to produce an annual balanced HRA budget, which is evidenced by the Business Plan update, therefore no alternative option was considered to producing the report.

11. **MONTH 8 CAPITAL APPROVALS**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 08 2018/19.
- 11.2 Cabinet requested a full stop after the word masterplan on page 123 so that the sentence read 'This increase is to reflect emerging priorities for the early stages of the Gleadless Valley masterplan.'
- 11.3 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-
 - (a) approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme

listed in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 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; and

- (b) approves the variations to the Housing Capital Programme as part of the annual programme refresh as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report.

11.4 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.4.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.
- 11.4.2 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.
- 11.4.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

11.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.5.1 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.