

Cabinet

Meeting held 15 October 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Leigh Bramall, Isobel Bowler,
Ben Curran, Mazher Iqbal and Mary Lea

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Isobel Bowler, Jackie Drayton, Harry Harpham and Jack Scott

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 MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2014 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Public Question in respect of MIPIM Conference

Mr Nigel Slack referred to a recent article in the Guardian newspaper about the MIPM conference. He asked if this was the conference that Councillor Bramall had attended in Cannes and if so would he be attending the one in London? He also asked whether, if he was attending the conference, would Councillor Bramall be under any restrictions about selling off Council housing?

In response Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Environment, commented that the conference referred to in the Guardian article was the UK version of the one he had attended in France. This was the biggest property conference in the world and it was important that Sheffield was represented there and try to attract investment to the City.

Councillor Bramall confirmed the Council would not sell Council housing off to private companies in the way that the Guardian article suggested. Councillor Julie Dore, Leader of the Council, added that even if Sheffield attended the conference with a particular product to promote, such as the New Retail Quarter, there would still be a proper process to go through before development could commence.

5.2 Public Question in respect of Contracts

Nigel Slack referred to item 8 on the agenda for the meeting 'Grounds Maintenance and Estate Services Review' which he commented was surprisingly good reading for those concerned about the City's past history of outsourcing decisions. He was also encouraged by the fact that the 'customer first' weighting equalled that of 'value for money'. He therefore asked whether this weighting would be applied to all future contracting decisions, whether currently outsourced or not? How might this affect contracts that were due for renewal but where the Council no longer had the capacity to bring those services in-house?

Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, commented that those kind of considerations were factored into every contract and it would depend on the nature of the contract/ For example if a contract was based on an internally focused service the needs of the Council Tax payer would not necessarily be taken into consideration. Service quality was factored in and contracts were not always necessarily awarded to the cheapest tender.

5.3 Public Question in respect of Treatment of a Citizen

Mr Martin Brighton asked what the Council's policy was when Councillors denigrated a targeted citizen to that citizen's peers, whose minds were then manipulated by those Councillors, so as to humiliate, demonise, disempower and isolate?

Councillor Julie Dore stated that the Council had a Code of Conduct and Members need to abide by it. Mr Brighton needed to be specific in reporting any such incidents as if any breaches of the Code were brought to the attention of Members they would be dealt with.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Recognition of Community Groups

Martin Brighton asked who had the ultimate say when deciding whether a community group was recognised by the Council – the Council or the people of the community?

Councillor Julie Dore commented that there were two different types of groups in this instance. Tenants and Residents Groups (TARAs) who would be recognised via the Council's TARA Recognition Policy. Each TARA would have a constitution. If a particular estate wished to establish a TARA they could approach the Council and the due process would be followed. If recognised they would then have to follow the Council's policies and procedures and would be derecognised if they didn't.

The second group was community groups who were groups with a particular interest and with which the Council often had regular dialogue with and were more than happy to engage with where required.

5.5 Public Question in respect of TARA Recognition Policy

Martin Brighton asked why, given that the TARA Recognition Policy had been

repeatedly rejected by the TARAs, was it being imposed under threat of derecognition?

Councillor Dore responded that she understood that most TARA's had accepted the Recognition Policy and had taken steps to adapt to it. However, she would ask Councillor Harry Harpham, Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods to provide a written response.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Sheffield Homes Rent Payment Cards

Martin Brighton asked why tenants were still using Sheffield Homes rent payment cards?

Councillor Dore commented that there were two different types of card and an explanation would be sent to Mr Brighton of their purpose.

5.7 Public Question in respect of Recall for Councillors

Martin Brighton asked that, given that Councillors generally supported the principle of recall for MPs, what objection can there be for recall to be applied to Councillors?

Councillor Dore commented that she believed in general most Councillors would agree that they supported the idea in principle. She would have no objection for it to be applied to Councillors if it became a proposal of Government.

5.8 Public Question in respect of Area Housing Managers

Martin Brighton asked why Area Housing Managers were arbitrarily deemed to be clinical psychologists whose opinion about the alleged state of mind of a targeted citizen was considered as evidence of criminal behaviour requiring sanction and prejudice?

Councillor Dore commented that Area Housing Managers were not clinical psychologists. She would not expect any members of staff to make clinical judgements about members of the public. If Mr Brighton had evidence of that being used as an excuse in the way individuals were treated she would like to be made aware of it.

5.9 Public Question in respect of Policy Documents

Martin Brighton asked whether the Council held any policy documents that the public were not allowed to see? (and if so, what were they?)

Councillor Dore stated that there were no policy documents that the public were not allowed to see. If something was Council policy she wanted as many people as possible to see the documents. It was important for Members to make clear to the public what the Council's policies were.

5.10 Public Question in respect of ERDF Funding

Martin Brighton asked what decisions had been made with respect to the latest tranche of ERDF millions (LEP and anti-poverty and match funds) to the region, and where were the documents demonstrating prior consultation and consent of those affected by the EU financed projects?

Councillor Dore responded that issues related to ERDF funding was led by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Initial consultation by the Government had taken place and more was due to take place up to 2015. The programme would probably not start for another 18 months.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

6.1 There were no items called-in for Scrutiny.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

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

Christine Allen	Teacher, Dobcroft Infant School	21
Norma Archer	Supervisory Assistant, Woodseats Primary School	25
Mary Collins	Principal Educational Psychologist	33
Joan Spriggs	Supervisory Assistant, Malin Bridge Primary School	37

Communities

Susan Clayton	Library and Information Assistant	23
Dianne Dudley	Library and Information Assistant	29
Julia Eastburn	Library and Information Assistant	23

Jane Godfrey	Support Worker	23
Linda Greenwood	Library and Information Assistant	28
Sheila Hawker	Service Development Librarian	30
Maureen Piggott	Library and Information Assistant	37
Claire Simpkin	Support Worker	21
Julie Skiba	Library and Information Assistant	30
Howard Spencer	Support Worker	33
Jenny Wells	Library and Information Assistant	34
Katherine York	Library and Information Assistant	34

Resources

Ann Sheppard	Escort	27
Lorraine Smedley	Senior Customer Adviser	34

(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. GROUNDS MAINTENANCE AND ESTATE SERVICES REVIEW

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Grounds Maintenance and Estate Services review.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report and the services efficiencies and savings that can be achieved for the HRA and General Fund;
- (b) approves the delivery of Housing grounds maintenance by a single service and that is to be achieved by the transfer of Estate Officers from the Council Housing Service to the Parks and Public Realm service with a review of the structures and job descriptions across Parks and Public Realm and Estate

services;

- (c) approves the reconfiguration of the remaining Council Housing estate services functions following the transfer of grounds maintenance work to Parks and Public Realm; and
- (d) authorises the Director of Culture and Environment and the Interim Director of Housing and Neighbourhood Services to take the necessary steps to implement these recommendations.

8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 8.3.1 The recommendations have the potential to improve equality of service delivery, maintain standards and provide financial savings to both the Housing Revenue Account and the General Fund resulting from increased efficiency.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 8.4.1 Five alternative options were considered during the options appraisal. The full details of the options appraisal methodology and results of the appraisal are included in Appendices B and C of the report.

- 8.4.2 In addition, integration of the Parks and Public Realm SLA work for Housing into the Council Housing Service's estate services were considered during the options appraisal. The Parks and Public Realm services were fully merged in 2012. Improvements in efficiency as a result of this merger, led to savings of 11% for employee costs and 6% of other costs. Officers felt that previous efficiencies and savings would be lost if Parks and Public Realm were to be disaggregated and therefore there would be a corresponding rise in costs in these areas.

- 6.3 This option was discounted by the options appraisal as the cost of delivering the service could increase significantly and therefore did not offer value for money.

9. **SHEFFIELD'S RIVERSIDE BUSINESS DISTRICT - TRANSFORMING A KEY ECONOMIC CORRIDOR IN THE CITY CENTRE FROM "GREY TO GREEN"**

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the Grey to Green project.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposed scheme, as detailed in the report and with the timeline described in section 4.6 of the report, subject to the required funding package being in place;
- (b) notes that a capital approval submission has been submitted in the Month 4 Budget monitoring report for the necessary authority to undertake and procure the proposed works, in accordance with Council procedures; and

- (c) delegates authority to the Director of Creative Sheffield, in consultation with the Interim Director of Legal Services, Interim Director of Commercial Services and Interim Director of Finance to negotiate and agree any agreements additional to those in paragraph 2 of the report required to deliver the works for the scheme, subject to the required funding being in place.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 This is a final opportunity to access ERDF funding for delivering a high priority scheme. To draw down the full ERDF contribution, the project must start and complete by Autumn 2015. To meet this programme, it was necessary to progress the design and tendering process now hence the request for conditional approval in advance of the final SCRIF decision. The detailed design work had to be undertaken concurrently with the approval process but will be completed by the Cabinet date.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 9.4.1 A more traditional reclamation and renewal of redundant carriageways could be undertaken and this group of highways was due for renewal in 2017 under the current Streets Ahead programme. However, this would simply replace like with like and a similar maintenance cost and would not deliver the transformative benefits outlined in the report.
- 9.4.2 Do nothing. For the reasons mentioned in Section 7 of the report this was not be a viable option. It would lead to further decline in the area, depressing property prices, sustainability of businesses which in turn would affect the Council's National Non Domestic Rate income. Finally, because of higher risk of flooding, marginal it may be, translated into both lack of an appetite for new investment and higher insurance premiums. The Council's own property in this area would suffer directly.

10. **INDEPENDENT LIVING SOLUTIONS**

- 10.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report setting out the background to, and ambition for, the first phase of the Independent Living Solutions programme and sought approvals in relation to the proposed procurement strategy.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the commissioning of and procurement strategy for the redesigned equipment service;
- (b) delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning (Communities), in consultation with the Interim Director of Legal and Governance and the Interim Director of Commercial Services to take the necessary steps to agree the pooled budget arrangements with the CCG and amend the

Section 75 Agreement;

- (c) subject to agreement being reached with the CCG and the Section 75 agreement being amended, delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning to take the necessary steps to implement the procurement strategy for the redesigned equipment service in consultation with the Interim Director of Commercial Services and the Interim Director of Legal and Governance;
- (d) delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning in consultation with the Interim Director of Legal and Governance to award the contract for the redesigned equipment service; and
- (e) delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living and the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, as appropriate, to take such steps as he deems appropriate to achieve the outcomes set out in the report.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The current contract for the supply and loan of equipment to help people live independently ends in June 2015 and we need a replacement arrangement to meet our statutory duties. We also need to refresh the scope and specification of the contract so that we can:

- achieve better outcomes and increased value for money where possible
- deliver against increasing customer expectations
- future-proof the service in light of proposed changes to legislation, guidance and operational requirements e.g. the Care Act, 7-day working commitment in the NHS, the Children and Families Act.

10.3.2 In order to maximise the efficiency of the proposed new service the Council needs to work with the CCG.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 **Do nothing:** This option was not favoured because the Council had legal duties to provide equipment to people in need as set out above.

10.4.2 **Extend the contract with the current provider:** This option was not favoured because it was believed that the service needed to achieve greater value for money and increase its impact. However, proposals would also be welcomed from the current provider on how they could achieve this (as per the new contract specification).

11. **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2015/16 TO 2019/20**

11.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing Members with details of the forecast financial position of the Council for the next five years and recommending the approach to budgeting and business planning that will be necessary to achieve a balanced budget over the medium term.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the forecast position for the next five years;
- (b) agrees the approach to business planning targets;
- (c) agrees the following approach to capital planning:-
 - Maximise flexibility in resource pools to ensure priorities in relation to housing can be most effectively achieved, including policies related to affordable housing
 - Manage capital resource pools including New Homes Bonus and Community Infrastructure to ensure that Council wide objectives are achieved
 - Reaffirm the existing Corporate Resource Pool allocation principles

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 To inform Members of the forecast revenue gap over the medium term and to recommend the appropriate strategy for balancing the budget over the medium term.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

11.4.1 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.

12. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2014/15 MONTH 4 (AS AT 31/7/14)

12.1 The Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the month 4 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2014/15.

12.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report on the 2014/15 Revenue budget position; and

- (b) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
- (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegations of authority to the Director of Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts following stage approval by Capital Programme Group;
 - (ii) approves the proposed variations and slippage in Appendix 1; and
 - (iii) notes the exercises of delegated authority by EMT and service Directors, and, the current position on the Capital Programme

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

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

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4. A number of alternative courses of action were considered as part of the process
1 undertaken by officers before decisions were 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.