

Cabinet

Meeting held 18 June 2014

**PRESENT:** Councillors Leigh Bramall, Isobel Bowler, Ben Curran, Harry Harpham (Deputy Chair), Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea and Jack Scott

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Julie Dore and Jackie Drayton.

**2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

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

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

4.1 The minutes of the previous meetings held on 16 April and 4 June 2014 were approved as correct records.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 Petition in respect of Broadband Access on Abbeyfield Road

A petition was submitted, containing 20 signatures, requesting the support of the City Council and local Councillors for faster broadband access and to lobby Virgin Media to install cable in the area and to complete the previous route that was stopped in the area.

**RESOLVED:** That the petition be referred to the Leader of the Council for consideration.

5.2 Public Questions in respect of Deprived Areas

Mr Martin Brighton asked a number of questions in relation to deprived areas in the City. Firstly he asked what criteria, in addition to the Government index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) figures, were used to measure the success or progress consequent upon pouring vast resources into a deprived area?

In response Councillor Harry Harpham, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, stated that the Council had a number of ways to track how well areas of the city were performing. Ward profiles were produced for each ward, setting out how well that ward was performing against the city average

on a wide variety of indicators across a number of topic areas, including demographics, poverty and access to services; economy and enterprise; health; housing; community safety; and environment. These ward profiles were publicly available on the Council's website. Individual programmes of activity would have their own evaluation and measurement mechanisms built into them to quantify the level of impact that programme has had.

Mr Brighton's second question stated that, historically, using the Government's own IMD figures, some deprived areas had either not improved, or improved negligibly, or even continued to decline, despite the vast resources allocated to that area. Was this information shared with the voters before elections, and if not, why not?

Councillor Harry Harpham responded that Information about each of the city's wards was made available publicly through the ward profiles as mentioned in the answer to the first question. Information about the Council's spending was made available in the annual budget report, which was also publicly available on the Council's website.

Mr Brighton's third question asked where areas had for fifteen or more years been designated as deprived, but had improved little or not at all, despite the continuing pouring of vast resources into those areas, up to the change of Government, which Elected Members had offered to stand down for what an outsider would conclude was years of failure, and if none, why none?

Councillor Harry Harpham commented that Members stood down every four years and it was then down to the judgement of the public.

Mr Brighton then asked given that these deprived areas continued to receive funds, perhaps justifiably, amid much publicity, and retaining the same political profile, how would this Council respond to any expressed perceptions that, in effect, political patronage was being bought?

Councillor Harpham commented that any such perceptions would be mistaken.

### 5.3 Public Question in respect of Public Questions at Council Meetings

Mr Martin Brighton referred to a recent Democracy meeting sponsored by the Houses of Parliament Outreach Service where he stated that local people said they refused to engage with this Council because there was no meaningful engagement in the decision-making processes that affected their lives and the communities, and that it was a waste of time attending Cabinet and Full Council to ask questions because they did not get answers, or were treated inappropriately. Mr Brighton therefore asked what the Council was doing to rectify this?

Councillor Harpham responded that Councillors were committed to responding to the views and concerns of residents and the Council actively supported a wide range of ways for local people to talk to politicians and those making decisions about the things that affected them. We are also very alive to the findings of the Fairness Commission around the need for better communication and involvement

of communities in the city with statutory agencies and one of the Council's Equality and Fairness objectives was to "strengthen the voice and influence of under-represented communities within the city".

Most Council meetings were open to the public and they could attend and ask questions. This included Full Council, Cabinet, and a range of other formal Committee meetings. The Council published details in advance so that people can know what is coming up and who best to contact about getting their issues raised and discussed. In the interest of openness and transparency recording was also allowed at Council, Cabinet and committee meetings open to the public. People are also encouraged to take part in the Scrutiny process, and the recent review of Scrutiny highlighted the importance of involvement of local residents, community organisations and partners as an important part of the Scrutiny process.

However, it was important to say, that formal meetings were not the only way people could get meaningfully involved in having a say and influencing the Council, particularly as many issues involved talking with people over a period of time to identify and understand issues and concerns and inform solutions.

#### 5.4 Public Question in respect of Residents Involvement in TARAs

Mr Martin Brighton asked who had decided that residents should be restricted in the extent of their involvement with TARAs and housing issues and when and why?

Councillor Harpham commented that residents weren't restricted in their involvement with TARAs and he wanted them to become more involved. The Household and Neighbour Adviser Panel was being established and the membership of this was being consulted upon. It was agreed that tenants only would be represented on that as it would deal with issues which directly affected them. There would also be a single leaseholder representative. Councillor Harpham welcomed and actively encouraged more people to become involved in TARAs.

### 6. **ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY**

6.1 There were no items called-in for Scrutiny.

### 7. **RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

7.1 The Chief Executive submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

**RESOLVED:** That this Cabinet :-

(a) places on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the City Council by the following staff in the Portfolios below:-

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
-------------	-------------	-----------------------

#### Children, Young People and Families

Carole Adams	Children's Centre Manager	37
Usha Bhan	Teacher, Tinsley Nursery Infant School	25
Louise Bull	Teacher, Learning Support	38
Jacqueline Damms	Senior Teaching Assistant Level 3, Watercliffe Meadow Community Primary School	22
Jeannie Devlin	Teacher, Greystones Primary School	25
Wendy Elliott	Senior Teaching Assistant Level 3, Emmaus Catholic and CofE Primary School	31
Ann Evans	Teacher, Stradbroke Primary School	21
Nina Hansbury	Teacher, Walkley Primary School	25
Elaine Heald	Supervisory Assistant, Stradbroke Primary School	24
Mary Jenkins	Teaching Assistant Level 3, Westfield School	29
Mary Kaye	Cleaner, Stocksbridge High School	25
Danny Lester	Teacher of English, Westfield School	33
Hilary Madden	Teacher, Meersbrook Bank Primary School	24
Julie Petty	Headteacher, Carfield Primary School	35
Sally Rogers	Deputy Headteacher, Wharncliffe Side Primary School	25
Fiona Snell	Geography Teacher, Westfield School	30

Angela Shrivastava	Teacher, Sharrow Primary School	29
Joanne Smith	Teacher, Dore Primary School	20
Krys Staszek	Teacher, St Marie's Primary School	37
Liane Taylor	Teacher, Stocksbridge High School	33
Decia White	Primary School Assistant, Grenoside Primary School	23
Angela Wood	Senior Teaching Assistant Level 3, St Thomas of Canterbury School	23

**Place**

John Smith	Community Tree Officer	35
Keith Stocks	Cemetery Operative	32

**Resources**

David Cantrell	Development Worker	28
David Ryszka	Finance	30

(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. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2013/14 MONTH 12 (AS AT 31/3/14)**

8.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the full year outturn statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2013/14.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report on the 2013/14 Revenue budget position;

(b) in relation to the Capital Programme:-

(i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in

Appendix 4, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or Delegated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;

(ii) approves the proposed variations and slippage in Appendix 4 to the report; and

(c) notes the year end position to the Capital Programme.

### 8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

8.3.1 To formally record 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.

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

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

## 9. **SHEFFIELD FOOD STRATEGY**

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the refreshed Food Strategy.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet accepts the refreshed Food Strategy.

### 9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 The actions specified in the original Food Plan do not reflect the current position with regards to diminishing resources and emerging priorities. Therefore, a refresh is required that also includes plans for implementation and clear governance arrangements.

9.3.2 Public consultation has told us that issues such as food poverty; cooking skills; food growing and the links to environmental sustainability and an understanding of where our food comes from; and the impact of takeaways on neighbourhood 'feel' and healthy eating are all important to the people of Sheffield. A Food Strategy for Sheffield will make clear the response that Sheffield City Council, and partners, will make in order to address these important issues.

9.3.3 The six chosen priorities are informed by research evidence and also by the experiential evidence and local intelligence gathered through the consultation process. By taking action in these key areas we will have an impact on the 3 key

outcomes – environmental sustainability, health and reduced health inequalities and a strengthened role of food in the economy.

9.3.4 The Joint Health and Wellbeing Board have already signed up to this policy.

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

##### 9.4.1 **Do nothing/Keep existing Food Strategy**

The risk of this approach is that the actions specified in the original Food Plan do not reflect the current position with regards to diminishing resources and emerging priorities. There is also the risk that due to the wide ranging nature of the original Food Plan and lack of clear governance in place that there will be little measurable progress.

##### 9.4.2 **Accept the refreshed strategy**

The refreshed Food Strategy has similar aims in terms of addressing the major food priorities in the city but focuses on a smaller number of key areas that can be delivered in partnership within current economic constraints. There is also now a clearly established governance structure and a clear lead within Place portfolio, working in partnership both within and outside of Sheffield City Council. This option will allow more tangible progress to be made and monitored.

## 10. **OUTDOOR SPORTS STRATEGY**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Outdoor Sports Strategy

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) agrees the core principles and strategic priorities set out in the report;
- (b) notes the financial implications;
- (c) agrees the Playing Pitch Strategy and facilities assessment outlined in Appendix 1 of the report as a guide to inform the development and implementation of planning policy and inform the assessment of planning applications; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Place in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance, Director of Finance and Director of Capital and Major Projects to enter into such legal and financial arrangements as appropriate and take such further steps as appropriate to achieve the delivery of this strategy.

### 10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The recommendations reflect the consensus of key partners and will be used to shape the future decision making and investment of the City Council and its partners.

#### 10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 This strategy is based on a joint programme of work with Sport England and extensive consultation with governing bodies and local clubs. The three core principles set out in the report closely reflect the thinking of the City Council and its partners and there is also significant consensus on the strategic priorities set out in this report.

### 11. **DECISION BY CABINET AS TRUSTEES OF THE FIRTH PARK CHARITY - GRANTING OF A LEASE TO PROVIDE CHILDCARE FROM THE FIRST START CENTRE**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report in relation to proposals to grant a lease to provide childcare from the First Start Centre.

- 11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet on behalf of the Council in its capacity as trustee of the Firth Park Charity:-

- (a) notes the principle Cabinet decision from February 2013 to cease the management and delivery of Local Authority managed nurseries and that this will be implemented by the First Start Nursery being operated and managed by the Hucklow Primary School; and
- (b) delegates authority to the Director of Capital & Major Projects to negotiate the terms of the licence and instructs the Director of Legal & Governance to prepare and complete all the necessary legal documentation subject to there being sufficient safeguards to ensure the existing and future usage of the nursery to both maintain existing services and retain the status of the building as a public asset.

#### 11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 This option:
- Allows the retention of the building as a public asset with present and future usage safeguarded.
  - Minimises impact on other services in the building.
  - The Council has already successfully transferred two of these YCC nurseries to schools
  - Provides continuity of and safeguards future delivery of good quality services to children in Firth Park.
  - Makes a positive contribution that is within the charitable objects of The Firth Park charity.

#### 11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

##### 11.4.1 **Closure**



This was not considered a viable option as it would be counter to the charitable objects of The Firth Park charity and create an unsustainable building and could impact on other service provision from the building

**11.4.2 Continue with the present provision**

This would not have been consistent with the Council's decision to withdraw from direct delivery and counter to the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2013 report.

**12. DECISION BY CABINET AS CHARITY TRUSTEES OF THE OXLEY PARK CHARITY - PROPOSED LEASE OF STOCKSBRIDGE LEISURE CENTRE**

12.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the proposed lease of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet acting for the Council as trustee of the Oxley Park Charity in accordance with the powers given to the Council as Trustee under the provisions contained in the Trusts of Land and Appointment of Trustees Act 1996:-

- (a) declares the former Stocksbridge Leisure Centre surplus to the requirements of the Oxley Park charity;
- (b) approves the 25 year lease of the Stocksbridge Leisure Centre to 4SLC in accordance with the terms of this Report and a Surveyor's Report in compliance with Section 119(1) Charities Act 2011;
- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Capital & Major Projects to instruct the Director of Legal & Governance to prepare and complete all the necessary legal documentation in accordance with the agreed terms and Charity Commission requirements to conclude the lease;
- (d) delegates authority to the Director of Legal & Governance to contact the Charity Commission and take such steps and enter into such documents as are required by the Charity Commission in order to give its consent to the lease; and
- (e) delegates authority to the Director of Capital & Major Projects or the Director of Legal & Governance to give public notice in accordance with Section 121 Charities Act 2011, in the local press to notify people within the beneficial area of the charity that the Charity Trustees intend to dispose of the leasehold interest in the Stocksbridge Leisure Centre.

**12.3 Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 The disposal of the surplus property will benefit the Charity and the local community by :

- removing a long term maintenance liability
- providing a new local social enterprise opportunity

- continuing to provide leisure facilities for local people

**12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.4.1 The property is surplus to the Council's and Charity's requirements.

12.4.2 The cost of the demolition of the leisure centre would have to be met by the Council at the request of the charitable trustees and would also remove any prospect of this type of leisure facility being provided for the local community for the foreseeable future.