

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Co-operative Executive

Meeting held 16 March 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Terry Fox (Chair), Mazher Iqbal, Jayne Dunn, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Paul Wood, Douglas Johnson, Paul Turpin and Alison Teal

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Julie Grocutt, Gillian Duckworth and Kate Josephs.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 It was reported that the appendix to the following reports was not available to the public and press because they 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 content of the appendix was to be discussed, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting:-

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Excluded Appendix</u>
24	Disposal of Land at Prince of Wales Road, Manor Top	Appendix 1
25	Procurement of existing Housing software solution and document management IT systems	Appendix 1 and 2

2.2 It was further reported that the following report was not available to the public and press because it contained exempt information described in Paragraph 3 and 4 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 and information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under the authority. Accordingly, if the content of the appendix was to be discussed, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting:-

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Title</u>
26	Future Delivery of Mental Health Social Care

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 No declarations of interest were made.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of meetings of the Co-Operative Executive held on 16th February 2022 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Nigel Slack asked the following questions on behalf of Robin Hughes:

‘These questions concern the former John Lewis building and public consultation regarding options for the site. On 16th February 2022, this Executive approved £3m for asbestos removal, which the supporting report confirmed "will be required for whichever option is decided for the future of the building". In the public consultation, asbestos was identified as a major challenge only for re-using the building, and not mentioned in relation to either demolition option, even though it is an identical challenge for those.

The consultation also claimed that demolition and the creation of a park would give “huge boost to the city’s long-term low carbon ambitions”. The supporting report by Arup says that a park would sequester only 230 tonnes of carbon dioxide over 25 years, which is the equivalent the carbon footprint of one average person in the UK - hardly "huge". This would require an estimated 900 trees, unachievable on the site, and much more than the 30 or so depicted in the consultation.

If the building is not replaced, an additional 4100 tonnes of carbon emissions caused by rebuilding will be displaced to other sites. This is obvious, since we expect and want jobs growth and more homes; and these and other uses the existing building might be put to would still require buildings. The Arup report acknowledges this, but omits the emissions from its conclusion. The consultation maintains that demolition options have the lowest carbon emissions, when in fact re-use has the lowest.

The Council has applied for a Certificate of Immunity from Listing, although this has not been publicised. My questions are these:

What steps will this Executive take to reconsult those who may have been influenced by the misleading information provided during the consultation;

How will the Council ensure that misleading information of this kind is not used in future consultations;

Will the Council make publicly available all the historical information or any

heritage assessment to ensure that interested parties have it when commenting on the Certificate of Immunity application.'

Councillor Mazher Iqbal responded to Mr Hughes' questions. Councillor Iqbal stated he had been working with Mr Hughes on a video on the Heritage List. He said that Mr Hughes and his colleagues were part of a roundtable discussion organised by The Sheffield Telegraph. He stated he would also provide a written response to Mr Hughes.

In response to question one, Councillor Iqbal said both he and officers did not feel the consultation information was incorrect. He stated that the material accurately reported direct carbon waiting for each option. He said that the Council commissioned a study of the carbon implications relating to three potential high-level options for the site, as this was a complex and technical area. He said that the wider carbon balance argument was complex and difficult to quantify, and he stated that as the city changed new patterns of working and technology emerged, and it was not possible to correlate removal of one building with the need to provide a corresponding building elsewhere to accommodate the economic activity. Councillor Iqbal said that this complexity meant that assessments were impossible to account for easily and were beyond the scope of a public exercise which covered a range of issues. He added that carbon emissions were just one factor in determining the outcome for the site and the city. He stated that all options were being considered, including retaining the building. Councillor Iqbal stated that before determining the future of the site a range of factors would need to be considered, including carbon emissions, feedback from the consultation, viability, deliverability, funding, and planning. Councillor Iqbal stated that a brief was being put together to consider all three options.

In response to question two, Councillor Iqbal referred to his response to question one.

In response to question three, Councillor Iqbal stated the building had been granted a Certificate of Immunity in 2002 and a request to renew this certificate had been submitted and would be made available on request.

- 5.2 Nigel Slack asked the following question: 'At item 18 in the meeting, the Executive are asked to approve the proposal of a new approach to local Heritage through the creation of the South Yorkshire Local Heritage List.

This is a laudable aim and one that could be an exemplar of the new way the city is to approach the participation of residents in decision making. However at Para 1.5 iv) the only members of the proposed 'assessment panel' mentioned for Sheffield are an SCC related group, a society of professionals in the field and industrial heritage specialists. They are all worthy members but the opportunity missed is that the panel omits any community focussed members, such as Joined Up Heritage Sheffield that represents at least 40 local community groups and supporters around heritage.

This is entirely at odds with the new approach being developed by the Governance Committee for May 2022 and again seems to relegate public

participation to nominating potential sites and basic consultation. The same paragraph at 1.5 v) puts the decision making power in the hands of the head of Planning, a potential conflict of interest due to what many people see as an overly close relationship between planning and developers.

Will Council therefore make JUH Sheffield a member of the assessment board, in line with the spirit of the report's Paras 1.1, 2.2 & 2.3?

Will Council place the decision making of approved sites in the remit of a relevant Policy Committee in the new Governance arrangement, rather than the Head of Planning?'

Councillor Iqbal responded to Mr Slack's question. He stated that Joined Up Heritage had worked with the Council for decades, and he said he felt it was important that the work they had done be acknowledged. He said that the Local Heritage List had been launched in 2021 and he encouraged groups such as Joined Up Heritage, alongside residents, to put forward sites for the list. He said he believed 80 sites had been added.

Regarding the Head of Planning, Councillor Iqbal stated he did not feel there was a conflict of interest. He said that the work carried out was in conjunction with the appropriate legislation. He stated that he met with the Head of Planning on a weekly basis, and he expressed his hope that the Head of Planning would attend the relevant committee in future.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 It was noted that there had been no items called-in for scrutiny since the last meeting of the Co-Operative Executive.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

RESOLVED: That this Co-operative Executive :-

(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>Place</u>		
Michael Ashton	Senior Building Surveyor	38
David Coggan	Water Feature and Street Scene Maintenance Operative	39

Brigitt Cowen Neighbourhood Manager 34

Adrian Roberts Estate Officer 37

People Services

Beverley Benson Support Worker 42

Joan Brown Occupational Therapy 35
Assistant

Ruth Clutterbuck Social Worker 40

Margaret Davis Senior Business Support 29
Officer

Karen Shannon Caretaker, Lydgate Junior 26
School

Denise Williams Team Manager, Adult Services 39

Resources

Alan Clow HR Service Manager 39

(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. PROCUREMENT OF SUPPORT FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE
AFFECTED BY DOMESTIC ABUSE**

8.1 The report sought approval to recommission a specialist therapeutic support
service for children who have experienced domestic abuse at home which will
form part of the Council's response to the new duty to provide support in safe
accommodation under Part 4 of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. This will be
achieved by pooling existing funding streams from the Domestic Abuse budget
and Children and Families with funds allocated as part of the Domestic Abuse Act
2021 new burdens funding resulting in one contract for £162,190 per year for 3
years plus one year plus one year starting in October 2022.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Approves the procurement strategy for a provider to deliver support
services for children and young people affected by domestic violence, as
detailed and set out in the report;

- 2) Delegates authority to the Director of Children and Families, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance to agree the terms of the contract and award the contract to the successful tenderer; and
- 3) Where no current authority exists, delegates authority to the Director of Children and Families, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Elected Member for Children and Families to take such steps to meet the aims and objectives as detailed and set out in the report.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

- 8.3.1 In the Domestic Abuse Act 2021, children who see, hear or experience domestic abuse are recognised as victims in their own right and therefore, this service will go some way to ensuring that those most harmed by their experience are supported in a way that helps them to recover. Sheffield City Council recognises that children living with domestic abuse are experiencing Adverse Childhood Experiences as a result and this may impact on their development and future life chances. The re-commissioning of the service and the provision of support to such children serves to help mitigate such impacts. The service will also contribute to meeting one of the strategic aims of the city's Domestic and Sexual Abuse Strategy 2018-22: *we will...Offer therapeutic support to children and young people identified as being traumatised by domestic and / or sexual abuse.*
- 8.3.2 The Domestic Abuse Act 2021 introduced a new duty on local authorities to provide support for survivors of domestic abuse and their children living in safe accommodation, including therapeutic support. Sheffield City Council was allocated New Burdens Funding to carry this out. Over half of the children referred into this proposed service will be living in 'safe' accommodation (e.g. refuges, domestic abuse dispersed accommodation, and properties where Sanctuary Scheme measures have been installed) and therefore this service will help ensure that the Council is able to meet this duty. However, the service will also work with children who are living in other forms of accommodation and that have been identified as needing intensive support by Children's Services.
- 8.3.3 This proposal is the preferred option as it will ensure that the Council is able to meet its statutory duty to support children affected by domestic abuse living in safe accommodation and also ensures that those children most severely affected by domestic abuse, whether they live in domestic abuse safe accommodation or not, will have access to specialist support at the time they need it most.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 8.4.1 The following options have been considered:
 - Bringing the service in-house to the Early Help (MAST) service. It is thought that this would not be viable due to the lack of specialist workers and the existing pressures on this service. This would also be a more

expensive option due to higher staffing costs in the local authority.

- Asking fieldwork social workers to offer the support to the children rather than a specialist service. It was felt that the support was best offered by a specialist worker without the statutory responsibilities and existing caseloads of social workers. This would also be a more expensive option due to higher staffing costs in the local authority.
- Not commissioning a service at all. This is not an acceptable option given that this would mean that the local authority would not be supporting victims of domestic abuse when we have recently published a strategy committing to providing support to children in safe accommodation in line with Part 4 of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021

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

Executive Director, People Services

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny Committee

9. PROPOSED USE OF DOMESTIC ABUSE FUNDING FROM CENTRAL GOVERNMENT FOR SPECIALIST SUPPORT FOR DOMESTIC ABUSE SURVIVORS/VICTIMS IN SAFE ACCOMMODATION

9.1 Part 4 of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 places a statutory duty on local authorities to provide specialist support to domestic abuse victims / survivors in safe accommodation. A government grant of £1,329,538 has been awarded to assist the Council meeting its new statutory duty. Approval is sought to agree proposed spending plans with any funds unallocated at this point to be approved via a delegated authority to the Director of Integrated Commissioning (in consultation with the Director of Adult Health and Social Care, the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Executive Member for Health and Social Care) to meet such statutory obligations.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Note the Council being awarded a grant of £1,329,538 for 2022/2023 from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to meet its new statutory duties under Domestic Abuse Act 2021 as outlined in the report;

- 2) Approve such spending plans as outlined in this report, in respect of the grant funding being awarded to the Council. Variations to be entered into once the funding has been received;
- 3) To the extent not covered by existing delegations, delegates authority to the Director of Integrated Commissioning in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, the Director of Adult Health and Social Care and the Executive Member for Health and Social Care to carry out such procurements regarding any funds as yet unallocated and award such contracts following a successful procurement process in order to provide specialist support services to domestic abuse victims / survivors in safe accommodation, in line with the report; and
- 4) Where no such authority exists under the Leaders Scheme of Delegation, delegates authority to the Director of Integrated Commissioning in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services, the Director of Adult Health and Social Care and the Director of Legal and Governance to take such other steps as may be necessary to meet the outcomes and objectives of the report.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

- 9.3.1 Sheffield has been allocated £1,329,538 in funding for the year 2022-2023 to meet the new statutory duties introduced by the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 and outlined within this report. Accepting the funding and allocating as outlined within the report will support the Council to meet those statutory duties.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 9.4.1 The Council could decide to not accept the funding however this would mean that it would be unlikely to be able to meet the statutory duties in the Domestic Abuse Act 2021.

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

Executive Director, People Services

9.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

10. PROCUREMENT OF SAFE SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FOR DOMESTIC ABUSE

10.1 The report sought approval for the recommissioning, through a procurement process, of safe, secure, supported accommodation for victims of domestic abuse.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) To note the Council's commitment to supporting victims of domestic and sexual abuse and tackling violence against women and girls;
- 2) To approve the procurement of safe, secure, supported accommodation for victims of domestic abuse and their children, as set out in the report;
- 3) Following such procurement, delegate authority where no authority exists, to the Director of Integrated Commissioning, People Service Portfolio, in consultation with the Director of Adult Health and Social Care, Director of Children Services, Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care to award and enter into the contract(s) to the successful bidder(s); and
- 4) Where no existing authority exists, delegate authority to the Executive Director of People Services, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services to take such steps to meet the aims and objectives of the report.

10.3 Reasons for Decision

10.3.1 This decision will build on Sheffield's proud track record in responding to the need for safe supported accommodation for people affected by domestic abuse. It will ensure that we are able to meet the requirements of Part 4 of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. It will ensure that high quality safe supported accommodation is offered that can meet need in line with recognised quality standards but in a cost effective way and the model allows for innovation and change within the contract period.

10.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

10.4.1 Consideration was given to commissioning the safe supported accommodation in two Lots as it currently stands. However, it was felt that one larger lot would have a number of advantages including: administration costs of contract management, the increased ability for partnership working and innovation to support all victims of domestic abuse, access to a wider variety of accommodation and more flexible use of the funding to be dynamic and meet changing needs during the 5-year contract period.

10.4.2 Consideration has been given to not providing refuge accommodation at all and only providing dispersed accommodation. However, this goes against the Council's previous commitment to strategically commission Sanctuary Housing, at great capital cost to build a modern state of the art refuge in 2014, with the associated borrowing assumptions being on a 30-year basis. We also know that

victims have differing needs and require choice of safe accommodation. Refuge blocks provide 24hour on-site support with additional facilities for children, and they engender peer support for women who have lost resilience due to their experiences. A refuge bloc provides a period of recovery, stability, safety and support for those most in need of support. The current refuge provision is always full, with a waiting list of women who want to be accommodated in this type of provision. During recent consultation with victims in safe supported accommodation more than 50% of victims stated that they had waited for a space in a refuge to become available as they wanted this level of security. 90% of refuge residents reported that they felt safe or very safe in refuge accommodation as opposed to 50% in dispersed supported accommodation. 85% of refuge residents said they had received the right amount of support compared to 50% in dispersed accommodation.

10.4.3 Consideration has been given to provide the service in house. It would be very unusual for Local Authorities to run refuges internally. Specialist voluntary sector providers have developed and ran provision for over 40 years and have become experts in working with victims of domestic abuse and running safe accommodation provision. Many of them are affiliated to National Women's Aid who have developed national good practice policies and guidance. Sheffield has a strong specialist domestic abuse sector with specialist knowledge and experience. The sector is also adept at bidding for additional charitable funding to enhance services and provide innovation that the Council might not otherwise have access to.

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**

Executive Director, People Services

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

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

11. MAINTAINING A STABLE ADULT SOCIAL CARE MARKET

11.1 The report sought approval for the recommended increases in fee rates for Council contracted and framework independent sector care homes, home care, extra care, supported living and day activity providers in Sheffield for the financial year 2022-23. The report also sought approval for the recommended increase in Direct Payments for people who choose this means of arranging their own care and support. The report set out the process that the Council has followed and the

analysis that informs the proposed fee rates to ensure a sustainable, quality and diverse social care market. The report also outlined the ambitions of the Council to deliver long term transformation in the city's care.

Letters received from care providers in the city expressing their concerns had been circulated to Co-operative Executive Members and the officer responded to the matters raised.

11.2 RESOLVED: That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Approves an increase to the fee rate for day activities and standard rate care homes of 3.13%;
- 2) Approves an increase to the fee rates for home care, extra care (care element only), and supported living on the Council's standard contracted and framework rate and to direct payment providers of 3.14%;
- 3) Approves an increase for non-standard residential care rates that are individually negotiated and for council arranged respite care of 3.13% subject to contractual compliance;
- 4) Approves an increase to the personal assistant rates used by people in receipt of a direct payment of 3.15% plus the cost of the Employer Pension Contribution (individually applied and total budget pressure not exceeding budget);
- 5) Delegates authority to the Executive Director of People in consultation with the Director of Adult Health and Social Care and the Director of Integrated Commissioning and the Executive member for Health and Social Care to agree any appropriate and proportionate fee increases requested by care homes outside Sheffield because cost pressures will vary from place to place; and
- 6) Delegates authority to the Executive Director of People in consultation with the Director of Adult Health and Social Care, the Director of Integrated Commissioning and the Executive Member for Health and Social Care to take all other necessary steps not covered by existing delegations to achieve the outcomes outlined in the report.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

- 11.3.1 In order to develop and maintain a stable adult social care market in Sheffield the Council need to ensure that the fees paid by the Council to providers for adult social care in the city of Sheffield are increased in line with the cost of delivering care in the city including inflationary pressures in 2022/23.
- 11.3.2 The impact of the pandemic and the wider economic climate on the adult social care sector is ongoing and the Council will continue to monitor the costs and pressures facing each type of care provision to support a sustainable, quality and diverse market during a very challenging and volatile time for providers, for people

who use services and for the Council and wider health and social care system as commissioners. The challenges facing the Council and the Care Market will require ongoing and dynamic risk assessment over the next 12 months

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 11.4.1 The Council has reflected on the feedback and the challenges facing the care market and acknowledges the wide range of pressures and variable factors that impact on the cost of delivering care in the wake of the pandemic, changing grant context and the impact of inflation.

The Council is also facing similar challenges compounded by long term and ongoing erosion of funding from Government. The Social Care levy on National Insurance will not provide additional investment in social care in the next few years as the initial funding generated will be deployed by Department of Health and Social Care to fund the NHS response to tackling waiting lists and health impacts resulting from the pandemic.

These challenges mean that a higher fee increase would significantly negatively impact on the Council's ability to deliver other social care services at a rate of more than £1m per additional percentage point increase in the fee rate.

The Council has necessarily had to consider a lower fee rate increase in the context of proposing a Council budget for 22/23 that is balanced by use of the Council's reserves, cuts to other services, ambitious savings plans across all areas of the Council and the Council's difficult decision to increase council tax, including the Adult Social Care precept. The Council has had to balance the extra costs to Sheffield taxpayers from the increase, with the need to protect its social care services to its most vulnerable residents. Further information on the Council's budget position can be found in the February report to Cooperative Exec published online.

The feedback from providers and the analysis of the cost of care and the current care market has highlighted that a lower fee rate than the one recommended for approval in this report would present too great a risk to the sustainability of the care market.

- 11.4.2 The Council has considered whether to adjust the care home fee to reflect lower occupancy levels. This option has been discounted however on the basis that there has been a gradual improvement in occupancy levels for a significant proportion of the care home market and some market contraction will be required.

A more targeted intervention will ensure that market reshaping is safely managed and protects the balance and continuity of care for those who need it in the city. Adjusting care home fees to reflect average occupancy levels would have very different implications for homes depending on their occupancy with some gaining and others still struggling to achieve viability. A targeted approach enables the Council to intervene to ensure that the inevitable risks associated with the contraction needed to achieve a balanced and sustainable, diverse and quality market can be best mitigated during a period of unprecedented market volatility.

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

Executive Director, People Services

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

12. THE FUTURE OF BUCKWOOD VIEW NURSING CARE HOME

12.1 The report set out a proposal for the council to consult then use results from that process and a simultaneous due diligence exercise to develop options then prepare a detailed options appraisal for the future Buckwood View Nursing Home that can be brought to the Co-operative Executive for a decision.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Approves the proposal to Continue the due diligence process with Guinness Partnerships and carry out consultation with current residents and staff in the nursing home and any other identified affected groups; and
- 2) Delegates authority to the Director for Adult Health and Social Care to design develop and implement the consultation.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 It will enable Adult Social Care, and other teams, to carry out a thorough options appraisal process and consider the future of this care home.

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 Once provided with findings from the due diligence, and consultation, the options appraisal will be developed.

12.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

12.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

12.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, People Services

12.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee

13. WORKING TOGETHER WITH THE NHS IN SHEFFIELD: FUTURE VISION AND GOVERNANCE'

13.1 The report provided an overview of the proposals in the Health and Care Bill for the creation of statutory Integrated Care Systems, to propose future arrangements for the governance of joint health and social care commissioning in light of, those proposed changes and to sought approval to amend the existing S75 agreement from 1st April 2022.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Note the proposals for statutory Integrating Care Systems (ICS) and the abolition of Clinical Commissioning Groups outlined in the Health and Social Care Bill;
- 2) Agree the proposals for future arrangements for joint commissioning of health and social care and the governance of those arrangements as set out in paragraphs 1.13 to 1.14 of the report;
- 3) Approve the revised scope and budget of the existing S75 agreement as outlined in Appendix A of the report, with the changes to take effect from 1st April 2022;
- 4) To the extent not covered by existing delegations, delegate authority to the Director of Adult Health and Social Care in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance, Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Executive Member for Health and Social Care to take such steps as are necessary to implement or facilitate the implementation of those proposals and the objectives set out in this report; and
- 5) Agree to receive regular updates on progress with the implementation of those future arrangements and on the Health and Social Care Bill.

13.3 Reasons for Decision

13.3.1 Our aim is to secure a healthier Sheffield, improved outcomes for people and form a stronger relationship with the NHS.

13.3.2 The Health and Social Care Bill sets out a framework for integrating health and social care starting with the development of Integrated Care Systems (ICS) to

tackle inequalities, improve population health and wellbeing, deliver excellent care, and maximise use of resources. It is likely that the Bill will be implemented in July 2022.

13.3.3 The recommendations in this report note the proposals in the Bill and enable the Council to prepare for its implementation; building on our current, successful, arrangements so that we can continue to collectively deliver excellent quality, personalised services which enable people to experience seamless services and live well and independently in communities across Sheffield.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

13.4.1 No other potential options are relevant.

13.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

13.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

13.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, People Services

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

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

14. **ADVOCACY HUB CONTRACT EXTENSION**

14.1 This item was deferred to the Special Co-operative Executive to be held on 24th March 2022.

15. **LIVING THE LIFE YOU WANT TO LIVE - ADULT HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE STRATEGY 2022-2030**

15.1 Adult health and social care is made up of a complex system of organisations that provide care and support to a significant proportion of Sheffield's population. We have been without a clear strategy that unifies this whole system in Sheffield for many years. Adult health and social care across the city faces substantial challenges, including the ongoing effects of the coronavirus pandemic, and we must develop a long term and ambitious response that commits to improving the lives of people who draw on care and support.

The new strategy meets our obligations under the Care Act to have a strategy for adult social care. It has been developed with citizens, providers, and partners. It

sets our vision for how the whole of adult health and social care will work together to deliver better outcomes for the people of Sheffield and tackle the challenges we are currently facing.

15.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

Cooperative Executive approves the new Adult Social Care strategy, setting a ten1year vision for the change we want to see in the way people are supported by the adult social care system in Sheffield

15.3 **Reasons for Decision**

15.3.1 Through significant local consultation and engagement, 'Living the life you want to live' sets out a vision and ambition for Sheffield's adult social care system that will better meet the needs of our citizens.

15.3.2 The intended outcomes are that people who need help and support in Sheffield will be:

- Safe and well
- Active and independent
- Connected and engaged
- Able to Aspire and achieve
- Supported by an Efficient and effective system

15.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

15.4.1 There is no clear alternative to an adult health and social care strategy. The strategy is needed – we have an obligation to deliver one under the Care Act. The Adult Health and Social Care Change programme, whilst moving forward, needs clear direction in order to be able to deliver against a long-term ambition.

15.4.2 In developing the strategy, two options were considered and rejected:

The strategy could have been a shorter-term vision. This was rejected because:

- there are significant challenges facing the social care system that are more long term in nature (such as training and recruitment of a quality workforce) so require longer term thinking
- a shorter-term strategy would likely only be able to focus on the current challenges
- market shaping needs a longer term vision to allow local providers to develop the mix of services we're looking to deliver whilst remaining stable
- national drivers, such as new legislation, are in development but we cannot continue to wait for them to be finalised – we have a clear enough picture to be able to drive local transformation

- 15.4.3 The strategy could have been smaller in scale, looking only to affect internal council services. This was rejected because:
- The scale of the challenges faced by adult health and social care need a system approach to be tackled effectively.
 - Section 6 of the Care Act sets out the Council's duty to make arrangements for ensuring co-operation on the functions of relevant bodies in the local authority area relating to adults with needs for care and support and their carers. This includes those we have defined in the strategy as the adult health and social care system: the people and organisations that are involved in providing adult social care. Our strategy should reflect this approach.

15.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

15.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

15.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, People Services

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

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

16. SECONDARY MAINSTREAM SCHOOL EXPANSIONS UPDATE

- 16.1 The report outlined the position relating to mainstream secondary school & Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) places in Sheffield over the coming years. The report also highlighted the capital funding pressures relating to the delivery of statutory duties in relation to the provision of mainstream and SEND places.

The purpose of the report was to seek Co-operative Executive approval for the use of Basic Need funding, alongside corporate financial support, to address the pressures on school places to deliver permanent and temporary secondary provision. This would include the potential expansion of two secondary schools in the southwest (SW) of the city and temporary expansions in specific parts of the city. This would also include the development of five integrated resources (IRs) to support an increase in SEND places.

16.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. In relation to the proposed expansion projects at Silverdale and King Ecgbert Schools:
 - a. note the recommendations on the Capital Approvals report (elsewhere on the agenda) to proceed with the projects at an

anticipated total cost of £12.8 million, and
b. approve that any shortfall from government funding allocations be met from the Corporate Investment Fund;

2. Approve the use of Basic Needs funding to develop options to meet the pressure on secondary school places in specific parts of the city in 2023/24, with any shortfall from government funding allocations to be met from the Corporate Investment Fund; and
3. Approve £1 million Corporate Investment Fund cash flow funding for the development of five integrated resources (IRs) to support an increase in SEND places.

16.3 Reasons for Decision

16.3.1 The preferred option is to:

- I. In relation to the proposed expansion projects at Silverdale and King Ecgbert Schools:
 - a. note the recommendations on the Capital Approvals report (elsewhere on the agenda) to proceed with the projects at an anticipated total cost of £12.8 million, and
 - b. approve that any shortfall from government funding allocations be met from the Corporate Investment Fund;
- II. Approve the use of Basic Needs funding to develop options to meet the pressure on secondary school places in specific parts of the city in 2023/24, with any shortfall from government funding allocations to be met from the Corporate Investment Fund;
- III. Approve £1 million Corporate Investment Fund cash flow funding for the development of five integrated resources (IRs) to support an increase in SEND places.

16.3.2 The above has been chosen because it helps ensure that the Authority's statutory duties relating to mainstream and SEND place are met, improves outcomes for pupils in the southwest of the city and also offers the potential to recoup funds through the sale of caretaker properties across the city.

16.3.3 The intended outcomes are:

- Development of permanent and temporary secondary provision in the city by utilising future Basic Need funding to meet statutory duties
- Development of IR provision to support the SEND strategy across the city
- Reimburse the corporate investment through the sale of caretaker properties

16.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

16.4.1 Do nothing

This option has been ruled out as the LA would be in breach of its statutory duties under the Education Act to ensure sufficient school places, promote parental

choice, diversity and fair access & also its statutory duties to secure the special educational provision specified in an EHCP pursuant to section 42 of the Children and Families Act 2014.

16.4.2 SW schools offer places above current admission numbers

This will involve negotiating with SW schools to accommodate the shortfall of places. Schools may be provided with Growth Funding as they have agreed to offer above current admission numbers on a temporary basis to provide a flexible solution that meets the Year 7 demand in the short term. This may reduce the threat of overcapacity in later years towards end of the decade also. However, SW schools will not be able to absorb the increasing demand over the next decade within existing accommodation as they are already near full capacity due to compounding effect of offering places above Pupil Admission Number the past few years. Health & Safety concerns around overall building capacity – corridor space etc - have also been highlighted to the Authority. There is a high risk that the Authority will be unable to fulfil its statutory duties if the required places are not offered by the SW schools.

16.4.3 City wide allocation

This would involve allocating pupils who are unable to obtain a place at a local school to travel outside of their local area/catchment to access a place in other parts of the city where places are available. This would keep a tight system as city moves into a surplus in future years and reduces need to invest substantial capital funding.

However, this could have a disproportionate impact on families. SW schools will have a less balanced socio-economic intake as children from deprived inner-city areas in the SW may miss out on admission to SW schools. This risks significant appeals from parents and puts pressure on schools outside of SW. If parents are successful on appeal, SW schools risk unplanned numbers through this process and have a further compounding effect on the overall capacity of the school. This would also have a greater level of impact on transport, impact on environment, cost for LA to transport these pupils out of area and cost to parents.

16.4.4 Independent school placement

Alternative options for SEND would involve placing children and young people in special school instead. This would likely result in increased high-cost independent placements, as some children and young people would not be able to be accommodated, due to limited capacity in the special school sector.

16.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

16.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

16.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, People Services

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

17. SOUTH YORKSHIRE LOCAL HERITAGE LIST

17.1 Sheffield City Council does not currently have a process in place for establishing and maintaining a Local Heritage List - a list of locally valued heritage assets, nominated mainly by members of the public and local interest groups. Such a list flags up heritage assets that are not designated (for example, not a listed building or a scheduled monument) but that have value. As such, Local Heritage Listing is recommended to help identify heritage assets that would warrant consideration in the planning process.

South Yorkshire Archaeology Service, as a joint service, has been awarded funding by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities to lead on the establishment of a Local Heritage List for Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield. In discussion with officers from the four authorities and using guidance on Local Heritage Listing produced by Historic England, we are proposing a Local Heritage Listing process that it is hoped can be followed for each authority. The process will ensure that nominations received are appropriately assessed prior to inclusion onto the Local Heritage List. The outcome will be allowing greater weight to the protection of locally valued heritage assets when planning decisions are made.

The report set out the process proposed for Local Heritage Listing, for formal adoption, including delegating the approval of heritage assets for inclusion to the Head of Planning.

17.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

Approve the proposed process for Local Heritage Listing, including:

- setting 7 selection criteria, as established by Historic England, weighted to reflect South Yorkshire's distinctive local historic character;
- using a panel of officers and members of key local heritage groups and/or other relevant experts, to make recommendations based on these criteria;
- delegating powers for the Head of Planning to approve the recommended inclusions, amendments or deletions from the Local Heritage List.

17.3 Reasons for Decision

17.3.1 The proposed assessment process will allow the City Council to have a method for Local Heritage Listing for the first time, improving services to local residents.

17.3.2 Adoption of the recommended process will help ensure consistency with the proposed approach to Local Heritage Listing by the other South Yorkshire authorities.

17.3.3 Obtaining the relevant delegation would allow Local Heritage Listing to proceed, in a sustainable manner.

17.3.4 The outcome we are seeking is to allow greater weight to the protection of a heritage asset on the Local Heritage List, when planning decisions are made.

17.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

17.4.1 The recommendation made is considered by Officers to be the most sustainable approach to Local Heritage Listing, by sharing the assessment process with the other South Yorkshire authorities, as well as seeking to ensure consistency with local listing by those authorities. The Council could do nothing but this would increase the risk that non-designated heritage assets of local significance are picked up late in the planning process, increasing the risk of issues arising and of local communities feeling their concerns are not listened to.

17.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

17.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

17.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

17.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

18. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) IN THE CONTEXT OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS.

18.1 Sheffield City Council's approach to allocating Neighbourhood CIL is detailed in a Cabinet Report dated 17 October 2018. This did not set out an approach to allocating CIL in Neighbourhood Plan areas.

Sheffield now has two approved Neighbourhood Plans – BBEST (covering Broomhill, Broomfield, Endcliffe, Summerfield and Tapton) and Dore.

The Council now needs an approach towards the allocation of CIL within Neighbourhood Plan areas.

The report sets out these proposals for how Neighbourhood CIL funding is allocated and spent in areas where a Neighbourhood Plan has been approved.

18.2 RESOLVED: That Co-operative Executive:-

1) agrees that from the date that a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted by the Council, the CIL Neighbourhood Portion arising from a chargeable development in the Neighbourhood Plan area is ringfenced for use in that area and is not collected into the single Local CIL pot;

2) authorises the Director of Communities, in consultation with the Executive Member for Community Engagement and Governance, to determine

(i) how the CIL Neighbourhood Portion is spent in a Neighbourhood Plan area, following engagement with the Neighbourhood Forum (or other formally constituted body responsible for developing the individual Neighbourhood Plan), local communities and Ward Councillors, subject to the proviso that monies are spent in accordance with the priorities identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and agreed Ward Priorities: and

(ii) to determine the terms on which such expenditure is incurred including authorising the completion of any related funding agreement or other legal documentation; and

3) notes that the collection and distribution arrangements for the Neighbourhood Portion agreed by Cabinet in October 2018 will continue to apply proportionately to any parts of a ward in which there is a Neighbourhood Plan that are not within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

18.3 Reasons for Decision

18.3.1 The proposals address the omission of Neighbourhood Plan areas from the 2018 Cabinet decision on the CIL Neighbourhood Portion and provide recognition of the valuable input of Neighbourhood Forums in their respective areas.

18.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

18.4.1 The 25% Neighbourhood Portion raised in the Neighbourhood Plan areas could be redistributed across the city using the process approved in 2018: pooling into a single Local CIL Pot (together with the 15% raised across the rest of the city outside parish council areas) and allocating the total across the city per ward based on deprivation levels using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). This could however be seen as contrary to the spirit of the Neighbourhood Planning regime.

18.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

18.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

18.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, Place

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

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

19. **CITY CENTRE STRATEGIC VISION**

19.1 The report provided a summary of consultation responses from the 5-week public engagement (called 'Our City Centre') and set out how the City Centre Strategic Vision has been adjusted to take account of the public's views and sought approval for the final version of City Centre Strategic Vision for Sheffield.

19.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Notes the City Centre consultation responses and proposed adjustments to the City Centre Strategic Vision; and
2. Approves the City Centre Strategic Vision for publication.

19.3 **Reasons for Decision**

19.3.1 The approval of the City Centre Strategic Vision, which has received clear support through public and stakeholder consultation and taken on the views of Sheffield's people and businesses, will form the basis for new development and investment geared towards improving opportunities for all. The 10 guiding principles in the Vision summarise the actions that are required to bring the City Centre Strategic Vision to life.

19.3.2 The intended outcome is to start to realise the full potential of the City Centre Strategic Vision, and the following short term next steps will be progressed to ensure this:

- 1. Priority Neighbourhoods:** Preparation of Masterplans and outline design principles to help shape 5 new distinctive neighbourhoods and to guide future development in these areas.
- 2. Delivery Plan:** To enable key sites to be brought forward for delivery that will catalyse regeneration in their respective priority neighbourhoods.
- 3. City Centre Investment Prospectus:** Building on point 1 and 2, this will clearly articulate the investment opportunities available within Sheffield's Central Area.

19.3.3 The outputs of the City Centre Strategic Vision and the next steps outlined in paragraph 6.2 will form a significant part of the emerging Sheffield Local Plan, a

key piece of evidence to shape planning policy and site allocations. The outputs will act as interim guidance and support for city centre development and help guide decisions on planning applications pending adoption of the Sheffield Local Plan.

- 19.3.4 In addition, the Council will be working hard to bring forward the improvements at key city centre sites such as Fargate & High Street, Castlegate and the former John Lewis Store using the feedback and views from the public engagement.

19.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 19.4.1 The alternative option would be not to produce a City Centre Strategic Vision. However, given the need for the city centre's continued regeneration in the light of retail re-structuring and other economic challenges along with the need to address the delivery of more homes in Sheffield, the need to deliver a strategy outweighs the option not to deliver one.

19.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

19.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

19.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

19.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

20. 10 POINT PLAN FOR ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE

- 20.1 The report set out Sheffield City Council's 10 Point Plan for Climate Action.

The 10 Point Plan provided a framework for action on climate change, describing the approach the Council will take to addressing climate change to support our transition to net zero, and the practical steps that will be taken and actions to be delivered in the short term.

- 20.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Notes the actions already taken by the Council as outlined in the report;
2. Agrees that significant action is required in order to reduce net carbon emissions across the City;

3. Endorses the 10 Point Plan for Climate Action as being the framework by which the Council will address net carbon reduction; and
4. Notes that regular progress updates on the delivery of the commitments in the 10 Point Plan will be brought back before elected members.

20.3 Reasons for Decision

- 20.3.1 The recommended approach was chosen because it was felt that the need to act at pace meant that delivering a framework for action initially would enable greater progress to be made on agreed projects and actions whilst work continued on more substantive actions.

20.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 20.4.1 This plan fulfils a commitment previously made at Co-operative Executive to deliver the recommendations of the Pathways to Decarbonisation Reports (sometimes referred to as the Arup report), so not delivering a plan was not considered. Developing more detailed plans for all of the priority areas prior to publication of the plan, or committing to significant but currently unfunded actions was also considered. Taking this option would have meant that the framework would not be published or action agreed for some considerable time, and detailed plans would be likely to fast become out of date.

20.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

20.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

20.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

20.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

21. STOCKSBRIDGE TOWN'S FUND PROGRAMME UPDATE

- 21.1 The report updated the Co-operative Executive on the Stocksbridge Town Deal ahead of the submission of Business Cases to the Department for Levelling Up, which would trigger the drawdown of the £24.1m funding. The report also sought approval to progress negotiations regarding the acquisition of the properties and all other interests needed to assemble the required development site and for the Co-operative Executive to in principle agree to the possibility that if the properties and interests cannot be acquired by negotiation then the Council, as a last resort,

would use the Council's Compulsory Purchase Order powers.

21.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Notes that the Council has been successful in being awarded in principle £24.1m from MHCLG and will shortly be submitted Business Cases to Government to draw down the allocated funding to deliver the investment programme;
2. Delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Resources, the Executive Director of Resources and the Director of Legal and Governance to enter negotiations to acquire all property interests and for the Director of Legal and Governance to draft and complete all necessary legal documentation to complete these transactions; and
3. Agrees in principle to the possibility that should any of the properties or interests required to assemble the development site not be acquired by negotiation then the Council be able to use its Compulsory Purchase Order powers as a last resort.

21.3 **Reasons for Decision**

21.3.1 The Stocksbridge Town Deal provides a major opportunity to fund significant interventions to address current and future issues and challenges within the Town. The requirement on the Council to accept and manage the potential revenue implications of developing the new Library and Community Hub, and the ability to use CPO powers as a last resort, if negotiations cannot be concluded, are essential to deliver £24.1m investment programme in Stocksbridge.

21.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

21.4.1 Do nothing – we could choose not to progress the work to submit Business Cases to secure the Towns Deal. This would be a missed opportunity to regenerate one of City's neighbourhoods. Fundamentally this is a once in a generation opportunity to address some key infrastructure problems faced by Stocksbridge with its unique geography and challenges, compounded by the pandemic.

21.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

21.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

21.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, Resources

21.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

22. MONTH 10 CAPITAL APPROVALS 2021/22

22.1 The report provided details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme as brought forward in Month 10 2021/22.

22.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Approve the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1, including the procurement strategies and delegate authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts;
2. Approve the acceptance of grants as detailed at Appendix 2 of the report; and
3. Approve the making of grants to 3rd parties as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report.

22.3 Reasons for Decision

22.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.

22.3.2 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.

22.3.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

22.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

22.4.1 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.

22.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

22.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

22.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Resources

22.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

23. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT PRINCE OF WALES ROAD, MANOR TOP

23.1 The report sought authority to sell Sheffield Council's land interests in property in the vicinity of Prince of Wales Road, Queen Mary Road and Riddings Close to enable redevelopment for a food led retail scheme.

Authority was required to include two vacant properties currently in the Council's housing stock at no's 6 and 8 Prince of Wales Road in the sale as they were required to facilitate access to the site.

23.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. It is recommended that the Chief Property Officer in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance be authorised to negotiate final sale terms and conditional contracts to enable the retail scheme to progress on such land as is required within the lands edged red coloured pink on the attached plan; and
2. The Director of Legal and Governance be authorised to draft all necessary legal documentation for the relevant sale of the land edged red and coloured pink for retail and the land edged red coloured pink hatched brown to the developer.

23.3 Reasons for Decision

23.3.1 The overall contract with the developer will enable the Council to achieve a capital receipt, bring forward the development of a retail scheme, achieve the redevelopment of an under used former school building and enable the accommodation of a popular boxing club and community facility.

23.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

23.4.1 Do nothing. The former Prince of Wales school buildings are underused but are in part occupied by De Hood Boxing Club. The maintenance and running costs of these dated school buildings are however disproportionately large and over the longer term the continued occupation of the school buildings by the boxing club cannot be sustained without ongoing financial support from SCC.

23.4.2 Maintaining the Boxing Club in its current location would prevent the retail

development at the site, result in an opportunity cost of £1.8m and require ongoing running costs of around £20,000pa the cost of which the council will continue to meet.

23.4.3 Retain the club in its existing position but on a regularised basis. SCC could compel the Club to sign up to a lease regularising their current occupation of the buildings, making the club responsible for running costs and ongoing maintenance costs.

23.4.4 In addition the retail development would not come forward and there would be a saving on running and repair costs in the medium term. In the longer term the buildings would fall into disrepair and there would be occasional calls for SCC to step in and provide funding and/ or the buildings would be left vacant and SCC would ultimately be liable for their demolition.

23.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

23.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

23.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

23.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

24. PROCUREMENT OF EXISTING HOUSING SOFTWARE SOLUTION AND DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT IT SYSTEMS

24.1 The report sought approval for the procurement of a Housing software solution and Document Management IT systems for the Council's Housing service. This would be procured via the Crown Commercial Services procurement framework Data and Applications Solutions RM3821 for a period of 3 years for the housing solution and an initial period of 3 years with an option to extend for a further up to 2 years for the housing document management solution

24.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

- 1) Approve the procurement of the Housing software solution and Document Management Systems via the Crown Commercial Services (CCS) framework as outlined in the report;
- 2) Approve the direct award of the new contracts to NEC Software Solutions Ltd as outlined in the report; and

- 3) Where no existing authority exists, delegate authority to the Executive Director of Business Strategy, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services to take such steps to meet the aims and objectives of the report.

24.3 Reasons for Decision

- 24.3.1 The contract with NEC for housing software and document management software is due to expire 31 March 2022. The housing service has a requirement to retain use of the systems to compliment and align to the PSR programme. A compliant commercial vehicle has been sourced.
- 24.3.2 Failure to secure a contract for the supply of these systems will impact on the Council's ability to provide a housing service to its residence and create a service gap until the PSR programme has delivered its outcome.

24.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

24.4.1 Do Nothing

Due to the anticipated expenditure for both software applications over the proposed term the Council is required to comply with Public Contract Regulations 2015 and therefore to continue use of the software beyond the current contract period would not conform.

24.4.2 Reduced Contract period

A shorter contract period was not taken forward for either software application due to the required alignment to the PSR programme and/or to longevity required to provide stability to the service and council tenants.

24.4.3 Open Market Procurement

The housing marketplace is very limited due to the bespoke nature of the service requirements in which the council are seeking to consolidate the requirements and commercial arrangements. The key players in the market are appointed to the CCS DAS framework and have already undertaken a competitive and compliant procurement process.

24.4.4 Use of a Public Sector Framework

The CCS DAS framework has been identified as a suitable framework in which to make a Call Off contract. It has already been competitively tendered and is compliant with PCR 2015 regulations. It enables a direct award via CCS e-marketplace.

24.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

24.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

24.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Executive Director, Place

24.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

25. FUTURE DELIVERY OF MENTAL HEALTH SOCIAL CARE

25.1 This report proposed a new approach to the delivery of Council duties to people experiencing a mental ill health who need social care services.

25.2 **RESOLVED:** That Co-operative Executive:-

1. Notes and approves the rationale for the proposal and agrees that the Council takes direct management responsibility of Mental Health Social Care Functions;
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Adult Health and Social Care to establish a programme board, develop an implementation plan and oversee a change process over the course of 2022-23 to enact the proposed change to the management of the Social Care Functions; and
3. To the extent not already delegated to them by the Leader's Scheme of Delegation, delegate authority to the Executive Director of People, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and Director of Finance and Commercial Services to prepare and execute all required documentation and take steps to implement these recommendations.

25.3 Reasons for Decision

25.3.1 It is anticipated that the recommended option will deliver the following outcomes for SCC:

- Higher quality provision which can be assured by the Director of Adult Health and Social Care.
- Closer integration and alignment of mental health social care practice with wider strategic health and care developments in Sheffield.
- More flexible approach to managing resources including the ability to redeploy more resources into preventative/early help provision or to align with primary care and community services.
- Clearer focus on the needs of carers and social care needs of clients to meet eligible care needs.
- Staff teams with clearer roles and responsibilities who are supported as social work professionals in their own right.
- Focus on recovery and support through clearer assessment and review.

- Less time spent managing the contract and seconded staffing function.

25.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

25.4.1 As part of the options appraisal exercise the following additional options were identified and evaluated:

- **Do Nothing:** SCC will continue with the current working arrangement with SHSC, and no strategic changes will be made.
- **Return staff to SCC and reorganise teams:** SCC Staff Members currently integrated in SHSC would return to the management, supervision and direction of SCC and the resources would be located within the adult social care locality teams or in some other kind of structure.

25.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

25.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

The report was not for publication because it contained exempt information under Paragraphs 3 (Financial & Business Affairs) and 4 (Labour Relations Consultations or Negotiations) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

25.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, People Services

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

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee