

Cabinet

Meeting held 17 February 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Ben Curran, Jackie Drayton, Jayne Dunn, Terry Fox, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea and Sioned-Mair Richards

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Leigh Bramall.

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 previous meeting of the Cabinet, held on 13 January 2016, were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Petition in respect of the Bannerdale Site and Consultation on School Places

5.1.1 Kitty Evans submitted a petition, containing 167 signatures, requesting that the City Council stop the sale of any part of the Bannerdale Site until after the consultation on new school site plans.

The petition stated the following:-

'We call upon Sheffield Council to stop the sale of any part of the Bannerdale site for housing, until proposed plans for the new secondary school on the "car park area" of the same site can be confirmed as representing a viable way to provide an outstanding new school.

It is not possible for the community or the Council to have confidence in the outlined proposal in advance of the Council vote on 17th February because:-

- *The "car park area" alone is clearly not large enough for the complete grounds of a secondary school, and would be even smaller than the original Holt House proposal unanimously rejected by the preceding consultation.*
- *Existing plans for new housing on the Bannerdale building footprint require the use of an access road from Carter Knowle Road which would run right through*

any potentially larger school site in the “car park area”. This would raise significant safeguarding issues for the new school or split the school awkwardly between two sites.

- *The “car park area” is described in several previous Council documents as being a former landfill site which has poor ground conditions that make it unsuitable for housing development.*
- *The new housing would require a system of open drains between the new school and Holt House Infants, in an area already prone to flooding.*

As such it is critical that no part of the Bannerdale site is sold for housing until it can be confirmed that the proposed plan is viable, as it may prove necessary to consider alternative options for developing the entire site once the feasibility of the current proposal had been further explored.’

- 5.1.2 In response Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, thanked Miss Evans for submitting the petition. She welcomed the fantastic response to the consultation on school places which had involved lots of people and resulted in lots of different options and views being put forward.
- 5.1.3 Councillor Drayton further commented that there was a need to make a decision about the building of a new school at this Cabinet meeting to ensure there were school places available for children and young people when they needed them.
- 5.1.4 To move forward with the process a decision was required to be made at this Cabinet meeting and then the process would then progress to the planning and development of the school and following that the statutory planning process would be followed which would include further consultation.
- 5.1.5 Councillor Drayton confirmed that the school would be developed with the criteria in mind, including building an exciting new secondary school including community facilities, protecting green spaces as much as possible, ensuring the design, as much as possible, didn’t add to traffic congestion or air quality and would ensure housing on the site.
- 5.1.6 There was planning permission for housing already on the site and all proposals and designs for the school would be subject to the statutory planning process. A decision needed to be taken at this meeting and could not be delayed to ensure school places were available when they were needed.
- 5.1.7 Councillor Julie Dore, Leader of the Council, confirmed that no decision would be made at this meeting about building housing on any specific area of the Bannerdale site. However, the plans for the site did include housing which was badly needed in the area. Part of the site had outline planning permission and the sale was ongoing to market. Should the decision on the school go ahead this would add another dimension to the viability of housing on the site.
- 5.2 Petition in respect of Proposals for a Through School on the Ecclesall Infant Site

- 5.2.1 A petition was submitted, containing 33 signatures, objecting to the creation of a new through primary school on Ecclesall Infant School playground. As there was no one in attendance at the meeting to present the petition, Councillor Jackie Drayton stated that a written response would be provided to the petitioner.

5.3 Public Questions in respect of Councillor Behaviour and Council Procedures

Martin Brighton submitted a number of questions in respect of Councillor Behaviour and Council Procedures as follows:-

1) If an Elected Member makes promises to citizens during a digitally recorded meeting, is it reasonable to expect that the Elected Member keeps those promises?

2) If the Elected Member does not keep those promises, would the Council Leader be reasonably expected to ensure that the Elected Member keeps those promises?

3) Should it transpire that the Elected Member not only did not keep the promises made, but also demonstrated that there was never any intent to keep the promises, is not that Councillor's position untenable?

4) Would the Council Leader have any objection to that digital recording being placed on YouTube, adjacent to an existing recording of a similar incident?

5) If a senior Council Officer gives an undertaking for an action, including a meeting with a concerned citizen, and it transpires that there was never any intention to either carry out the action or hold the meeting, is there any case for that officer's continuing employment within this Council?

6) Is it not reasonable, if a Councillor is repeatedly informed of a Council document demonstrating an illegal activity within the Council, that the named department would be investigating, the culprit identified, and any wrong put right?

7) Should a Councillor fail to respond, as required by question 6 above, is not their position untenable?

8) Should a senior Council Officer fail to take appropriate action consequent upon question 6 above, is not that senior Officer's position untenable?

- 5.3.1 Councillor Julie Dore responded that Mr Brighton's questions appeared to refer to a specific incident and a specific Elected Member. As the incident and Member had not been cited Councillor Dore could not answer Mr Brighton's questions. If he wished to put in writing the incident and the Member concerned a response would be provided.

5.4 Public Question in respect of Northern Powerhouse

- 5.4.1 Nigel Slack asked, with the Government continuing to prove by its deeds (BIS

closure, Bradford's photo collection, 85% of hardship funding going to Tory Councils) that its words on the Northern Powerhouse are ringing hollow, can the Council still be confident that the promises contained in the proposed 'devolution' deal will be honoured?

5.4.2 Councillor Julie Dore commented that the BIS closure had come as a shock especially considering the Government must have taken time to make the decision and done a full appraisal on it. For the Council therefore to find out about the decision on the morning that consultation on staff redundancies began was shocking.

5.4.3 Upon finding out about the decision, Councillor Dore wrote to the Secretary of State outlining the Council's concerns over the loss of jobs particularly in the light of the Government's statements for the past months that the Northern Cities would be where the growth would be seen in this country. On the one hand therefore the Government were seeking inward investment into the Northern Cities whilst at the same time disinvesting with decisions such as the BIS closure.

5.4.4 Councillor Dore did not receive a response to her letter to the Secretary of State within 7 days and therefore wrote to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. As a result, a response was received from the Secretary of State which Councillor Dore was still not happy with. Councillor Dore stated that she then wrote a further letter to the Secretary of State outlining that she was not happy with the response and consequently the Secretary had agreed to a meeting to discuss Councillor Dore's concerns.

5.4.5 Councillor Dore had also discussed the issue of the Government's hardship funding with other Core Cities. She was concerned that the Northern Cities had faced cuts for a number of years and not been given any funding to cope with this and now when it appeared that Conservative Councils were beginning to suffer they were offered funding to manage these pressures. The Core Cities would discuss further how they would respond to the Government on this issue.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Devolution

5.5.1 Nigel Slack commented that the public response to the proposed 'devolution' deal consultation (250 across the region, 50 of which were Social media contacts of Mr Slack) had been woefully low and illustrated the concerns he had raised over the timing and lack of publicity about the consultation. That aside, Mr Slack asked when will the full details of the consultation be available to the public?

5.5.2 Councillor Julie Dore responded that the 9 local authorities in the Sheffield City Region had not all decided their membership status and as such declared their position on the Devolution deal which Councillor Dore believed appeared to offer positive provision for the City Region. Once all the 9 local authorities had declared their position statutory consultation would have to take place. This would be dictated by the Government and the City Council would then decide how to inform and consult. A date for this could not yet be confirmed but it was likely to take place shortly.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Budget Reserves

5.6.1 Jeremy Short asked was it not possible to use £27.6 million from reserves to prevent any cuts to Portfolio Services in 2016-17, i.e. only spend £52.5 million on financing the pension fund deficit in 2016-17 instead of paying £80.1 million?

5.6.2 In response Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, commented that he would respond in writing to the more detailed proposals Mr Short had emailed to him. If the Council were to pursue the route suggested by Mr Short, Councillor Curran questioned whether this would even be legal.

5.6.3 Councillor Curran further commented that Mr Short's proposals would also have practical implications for the Council. The money would be gone and the Council would still have to make the same level of cuts over two years. There would be a need to replenish the Streets Ahead funds which would raise the question of fairness for those who had not yet had their roads repaired. There would also be abortive costs and the risk of clawback.

5.6.4 In conclusion therefore, whilst thanking Mr Short for his suggestion, Councillor Curran did not believe this represented a practical solution. It may appear clear on a spreadsheet but the Council needed to make a budget for the next few years rather than just the next year. The budget needed to be signed off legally and Mr Short's proposal would call this into question.

5.7 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.7.1 Lauren Slent commented that the Council had stated their proposal as 'Creation of junior places for the children who attend Clifford Independent School by changing the age range to become a through primary'. Council officers and Cabinet Members had verbally and in writing confirmed that the Council had committed to working alongside local people to build a junior phase for Clifford. She therefore stated that people were pleased that the Council continued to commit to listening to them and Lauren and others would like the Council to clearly state the next steps in making the successful infant school into a through primary?

5.8 Public Question in respect of School Places

Jen Hardy stated that every child in Clifford Church of England school will be affected by the proposal to expand Ecclesall Infant School, as the Junior phase for the school will be affected financially and in many other ways. Those concerned therefore requested the right to partner equally in the proposed consultation, and to include options which will provide the best outcomes for all children such as:-

(A) sell the Junior School site and divide the proceeds between feeder infant schools, allowing Clifford Infant School to become a through infant school on our Psalter Lane Site; and

(B) propose that Ecclesall Infant expands as a two form intake primary school, and that Clifford Infant increases to a two form Infant School on Psalter Lane,

feeding a two form Clifford Junior School on the Ringinglow Road site. This would fulfil the 30 extra places required, and crucially, avoid the loss of 240 faith school places in the area.

5.9 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.9.1 Ian Platts commented that in respect of the report on School Places, on the agenda for the meeting, it was indicated on the Policy Checklist that there were no implications in respect of Equal Opportunities.

5.9.2 Mr Platts therefore stated that when the continuity provided by a through school on one site was deemed to provide best outcomes and to be the preferred option for a secular school i.e. the proposed new Ecclesall Primary, why this benefit was not to be extended to the children in faith based education? They will be split over two sites, with very unclear details for how the Ecclesall Junior site will be run. It seemed to Mr Platts that an outstanding faith based school (Clifford Infant) was being sidelined or marginalised and around 240 faith based education places will be lost. Would you please explain how this provides equitable access or equal opportunities?

5.9.3 Mr Platts further commented that to increase understanding, or for the avoidance of doubt, Clifford Infant provided a Christian based education via St Andrews Church, which was an Anglican/Methodist partnership, however it was open to and welcomed all faiths and currently included children of other faiths. Some parents of other faiths actively chose this school as they preferred a faith based education to a secular one. Would the Council please state whether it would prefer not to invest in or support such faith based education?

5.10 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.10.1 Alex Miller asked why is the proposed consultation limited to expanding Ecclesall infants to become an all through primary? Why isn't the option proposed by Clifford Governors being consulted on?

5.11. Public Question in respect of School Places

5.11.1 Neil Fitzmaurice asked will the Cabinet and Officers ensure the consultation on the building of a new school on the Ecclesall Infants site is thorough, inclusive and transparent with maximum effort made to involve local residents, unlike the phase carried out in the autumn term? Will the Cabinet also accept that other options for the provision of school places in this area should remain open until this option has been robustly examined?

5.12 Public Question in respect of the Value for Money of the new Ecclesall Through Primary

5.12 Laurence Mosley commented that he was a Governor of Clifford_School. He asked that the value for money aspect was further considered in the next consultation and fully costed options disclosed to the public. The reason that they needed publishing was that for Clifford parents there was a perceived agenda of

not extending Clifford at any costs. The investment in any option is public money and there should be transparency in the process, this has so far been lacking as no financial data had ever been disclosed.

5.12.1 Mr Mosley added that the logic of building a brand new school versus extending Ecclesall Primary and extending Clifford into the premises next door didn't seem to make financial sense. This would also leave a school of 120 pupils in a building that was described by current governors as not fit for purpose. Possible options were:-

1) Currently as proposed build a new primary school with capacity for 3 form entry. Leave Juniors as is.

2) Build new junior school with 2 form entry, move Clifford/Ecclesall Juniors to a 2 form entry school. Could leave new build with 3 forms to create latent capacity.

3) Refurb Juniors – 3 form entry, leave juniors as it is. Extend Clifford next door to incorporate a junior phase (£2.7m)

5.12.2 Mr Mosley commented that the Council would need to consider the operating costs of running the schools suggested above, as some configurations will be more expensive, e.g. if 2/3 extra staff were required over 25 years equivalent there would be approximately £2.5m extra costs. The Council also needed to consider the environmental impact locally of putting all the growth into one street. Could the Council please therefore explain how a new school made economic sense?

5.13 Councillor Jackie Drayton then responded to the questions in paragraphs 5.7-5.14 as they all concerned one area of the proposals. She thanked everyone for their questions and stated that written responses would be provided, particularly where detailed proposals were presented.

5.14 Councillor Drayton further commented that she did have meetings with Clifford Governors, the Head of the School and the Diocese who presented their vision to have a through school on the Clifford site. The Council had set out the rationale of why school places in the area were needed. 2 proposals were suggested to deliver this. The Council could not support both options and needed to support the option that fitted best as to where places were needed and which was the best value for money.

5.15 Councillor Drayton recognised that the preferred option of the Council was disappointing for Clifford School and its Diocese and would raise questions about Ecclesall Junior School. Further discussions would be needed as to how to move forward and a meeting had been arranged with the Diocese.

5.16 Councillor Drayton expressed regret if people believed they didn't have the chance to express their views in the consultation. The Council had received many comments from residents in the local areas. Because of the proposal to expand Ecclesall Infant to a through school, there was a legal requirement for the Council to reconsult for 4 weeks which residents would be part of.

5.17 Councillor Drayton added that, once the plans were developed, they would need to go through the statutory planning process which included traffic and highway management assessments so there would be a further opportunity for people to express their views.

5.18 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.18.1 Helena Jones commented that a new secondary school caused disruption to families having children at different schools and catchment changes. Therefore, why is a new secondary school being built at great expense in a congested area when Silverdale, King Egberts, Tapton and Newfield have all agreed to expand which would cover the extra children?

5.19 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.19.1 Ted Gunby, Chair of Carterknowle and Millhouses Community Group, submitted the following questions in respect of School Places:-

1) Bearing in mind that this proposal was not a formal Council one and was published on only the final day of the consultation process, will the Cabinet defer a decision to enable proper consultation on this proposal in line with the Ombudsman's recommendations and its own policies on citizen involvement?

2) Do Members appreciate that a decision to build housing and a school on the site would be seen as duplicitous and greedy, given that the previous consultation clearly limited the area on which building could take place and the Council then concluded:-

- "Should a future applicant wish to develop any of the open space instead of the housing area it must have a compelling rationale showing how the open space could be replaced within the site" and

- "Quantitative shortage of open space in the area means that proposals for the loss of open space will not be permitted (Core Strategy 46)"

3) Are Members aware of the status of the car park where the school is proposed in so far as:-

- Sports England licensed the building of the car park on sports pitches for a limited time (now expired) with the condition that the green space would be restored; and

- The Council is on record as saying "The north of the area (including the car park) is a former tip which has poor ground condition which means this area precludes housing development"?

4) Does the Cabinet accept that even replacing the housing with a school is not a satisfactory solution given that there is a quantitative shortage of green space in the area (even less than Darnall and Tinsley) and that the loss of accessible

green space would be far greater than the mere footprint of the school buildings?

5.20 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.20.1 Laurence Mosley stated that the proposed new secondary school on the Bannerdale site is going to be built on a site that was occupied by Abbeydale Grange and closed in 2010. Mr Mosley hoped the Council Members would ask the Executive why this school was demolished in the first place as it seemed a total waste of taxpayers' money.

5.20.2 Mr Mosley added that the new school, despite all objections, was going to be on an extremely small footage of land, which was a car park servicing the school and could not be sold to developers as it was contaminated land. Would any of the Councillors feel comfortable sending their children to such a school?

5.21 Public Question in respect of School Places

5.21.1 Kitty Evans commented that in 2013 the car park area of the Bannerdale Centre was deemed unsuitable for development. Now the Council were proposing to build a school there. What has changed since then?

5.22 In response to the questions in paragraphs 5.18-5.21 above, Councillor Jackie Drayton commented that she would be willing to send children to the school on the site and she hoped that the school would be outstanding, as was the aim for every school in the City.

5.23 When the initial proposals were sent out to consultation the original proposals were to build on the Bannerdale site and at Holt House School. There was an overwhelming negative response to the Holt House as people believed the site was too tight, it would create traffic problems, worsen air quality and was generally not suitable.

5.24 Following this, Councillor Drayton commented, the whole site was looked at again. There was always a pledge to retain as much green and open space as possible, develop housing, which was badly needed in the area and to create a school.

5.25 Evidence had shown that in the last September intake in the South West of the City, parents had had a particularly difficult time getting their children into a school within their catchment area. One of the options suggested was to add places to all schools in the area. However, evidence had shown there was a spike in numbers forthcoming and this would mean a new school would have to be built in 4 years anyway even if places were added to all schools now.

5.26 Councillor Drayton further stated that one of the proposals was to permanently expand Silverdale School. However, the Council did not wish to set up a school to fail so the proposal was amended to temporarily expand Silverdale to assess the impact to ensure it was a successful school.

5.27 Catchment areas would be looked at moving forward. The Council did not want to

put any school at risk so catchment areas would be created which were fair and equal.

- 5.28 In reference to the questions about Abbeydale School, Councillor Drayton commented that this was a different situation as the school was only 40% full at the time of closure and places were not needed. The Council knew that the secondary population would grow in coming years and a new school might be needed, but couldn't be sure at that time exactly where. There had been major demographic changes in the South West and North East of the City in recent times. In the South West more families with children were moving into houses which used to have older people living in. The North East had seen a number of new arrivals. There had also been a 25% increase in the birth rate nationally and in some areas of Sheffield, higher than this.
- 5.29 The Council had a duty to be responsible and assess the most appropriate options for providing places. The green space referred to had actually been school playing fields so was not classed as open space as such. When the Bannerdale site was opened up the Council looked closely to see how the green space would work for the community and be protected.
- 5.30 It was clear from all the evidence that a new school was needed in this area. It was surely right to use land which the Council owned to develop this rather than buying land. Councillor Drayton concluded by commenting that she was certain that the proposals were the best for the future of children and young people in the City and that school places were made available where they were needed and where local people could go to local schools.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

- 6.1 There were no items called-in from Scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

The Interim Executive Director, Resources 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>
<u>Children, Young People and Families</u>		
Marian Broadhurst	Team Manager	37
Julia Buck	Administrator, Lydgate Junior School	22

Robert Edwards	Trainer/Assessor	26
Jeanette Lipscombe	School Manager, High Green Primary School	33
Maimona Azim Malik	Senior Teaching Assistant Level 3, Whiteways Primary School	29
Susan Traynor	Cleaner, Rainbow Forge Primary School	20
Avril Young	Headteacher, Rowan School	44

Place

Robert Amos	Ranger	38
Andrew Beevers	District Officer, Parks and Countryside	38
Phillip Creaser	Administrative Assistant	31
Carol Cresswell	Technical Manager – Architecture	32
Richard Cubison	Senior Structural Engineer	27
Brian Curry	Assistant Manager (Operations)	29
Richard Dalgarno	Licensing Analyst and Processing Officer	38
John Earl	Environmental Enforcement Officer	28
Margaret Ibbotson	Administrative Assistant	30
Peter Mann	Senior Public Rights of Way Manager	41
Deborah Parkinson	Enforcement Officer	25
David Sowter	Senior Engineer	41
George Taylor	Environmental Health Technician	40
Diane Wombwell	Administrative Assistant	31

Resources

Catherine Flannery Human Resources Consultant 31

(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. HOUSING INDEPENDENCE COMMISSIONING STRATEGY 2016-2020 AND DELEGATED DECISION MAKING

8.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report in relation to the Housing Independence Commissioning Strategy 2016-20 and delegated decision making.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the content of the report is noted and approval is given to the high level Commissioning Strategy;
- (b) authority be delegated to the Director of Commissioning to terminate contracts relevant to the delivery of the Housing Related Support Strategy and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contracts;
- (c) in accordance with the high level commissioning strategy and this report, authority be delegated to the Director of Commissioning to:
 - (i) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living and the Director of Commercial Services, approve the procurement strategy for any service delivery during the period of the strategy;
 - (ii) in consultation with the Director of Commercial Services and the Director of Legal and Governance, award, vary or extend contracts for the provision of housing related support; and
 - (iii) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Commercial Services, make awards of grants;
- (d) authority be delegated to the Director of Commissioning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, the Director of Legal and Governance and the Director of Commercial Services, to take such other steps as he deems appropriate to achieve the outcomes in this report;
- (e) the Director of Commissioning shall only procure and award contracts for the provision of supported accommodation where the use of Council

Housing accommodation is integral to the support, in consultation with the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and where the appropriate approval for that use of the accommodation is in place; and

- (f) the Director of Commissioning shall only procure and award contracts for the provision of supported accommodation, where there will be implications for housing benefit subsidy loss, in consultation with the Director of Finance Service.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

- 8.3.1 The previous delegated decision process set out in the 2009 to 2014 report is now out of date and therefore needs revising.
- 8.3.2 A number of changes to the Director responsibilities, national and local funding arrangements and Council Policy on what it will fund in relation to Housing Related Support Services means that a formal refresh of the delegated decision making arrangements is required.
- 8.3.3 A new high level commissioning plan has been developed, which specifies a number of individual commissioning activities and individual procurements that will need to take place.
- 8.3.4 The overall plan needs to be approved and individual procurement decisions need to be delegated to reflect the number and speed of decisions that need to take place.
- 8.3.5 The delegation for decision making will need to reflect the range of individual decisions that need to be undertaken. For example, some of the commissioned support services require the use of Council housing stock, therefore these decisions need to be made alongside the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods for the use of the housing stock.
- 8.3.6 Supported Housing has a complex interrelationship with housing benefit depending on who the landlord is and what conditions for residence and eligibility are fulfilled. At times this may result in subsidy loss from central government where the landlord is not a Registered provider (this usually affects tenants of Charities who run supported housing). Where subsidy loss is a risk the Housing Independence Service will take all steps to mitigate this risk, whilst ensuring that the best provider for people is commissioned. Where there are any implications, decisions will be made in consultation with the Director of Finance.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 8.4.1 There were no alternative options presented in the report.

9. VOLUNTARY SECTOR GRANT AID INVESTMENT IN 2016/17

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Communities submitted a report seeking approval for

recommended investment in the voluntary and community sector for 2016/17 from the Council's Grant Aid budget. This budget was subject to approval of the Council budget for 2016/17 to be adopted at Council on 4 March 2016.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) having had due regard to the provisions of Sections 149 and 158 of the Equality Act 2010 and Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and to the issues raised by those provisions, approves the grant agreement extension recommendations listed in Section 4 of the report, and detailed further in Appendix 1;
- (b) endorses the Voluntary Sector Grants Fund grant agreement extension process described in Appendix 2 of the report and to approve the actions, arrangements and recommendations at Sections 4 and 11;
- (c) delegates authority to the Executive Director of Communities:-
 - (i) to administer the Lunch Clubs Small Grants Fund as described in Appendix 1 of the report;
 - (ii) to agree the terms of and authorise the completion of all funding agreements, including amendments to the terms of any existing grant funding agreements, relating to grants made from the Lunch Clubs Small Grants Fund and the Voluntary Sector Grants Fund, together with any other associated agreements or arrangements that they may consider appropriate, provided that if the terms of a proposed funding agreement or amendments to the terms of an existing agreement involve the variation of any standard terms previously agreed by Internal Audit and / or Legal Services, the agreement shall not be completed without the consent of the Chief Internal Auditor and the Director of Legal and Governance; and
 - (iii) to review, adjust or suspend grant awards where (A) a change of circumstance affects the ability of an organisation to deliver the purpose of the grant awarded, (B) the Executive Director of Communities considers the performance of the organisation to be below an acceptable standard or (C) an organisation has breached any of the award conditions contained in their funding agreement; and
- (d) delegates authority to the Executive Director, Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Equality:-
 - (i) to agree the amounts, purposes and recipients of any individual grants awarded in year from the Grant Funds including any additional sums received or returned or unpaid funds;
 - (ii) to withdraw grant awards where (A) a change of circumstance affects the ability of an organisation to deliver the purpose of the grant

awarded or (B) the Executive Director, Communities considers the performance of the organisation to be below an acceptable standard or (C) an organisation has breached any of the award conditions contained in their funding agreement,; and

- (iii) to allocate any other additional sums that may be received in year from other parts of the Council or other partners as part of the Council Grant Aid process to fund local voluntary sector activity.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 The allocation of this funding to preventative services will fundamentally contribute to the Values, Priorities and Strategic Outcomes of the Council's Corporate Plan 2015-18. In particular -

Priorities

- Tackling inequalities
- Better health and wellbeing
- In-touch organisation

9.3.2 In addition, the allocation of this funding will contribute to the Fairness Commission's recommendations around –

- Health & Wellbeing for All
- Fair Access to High Quality Jobs and Pay
- Fair Access to Benefits and Credit
- Housing and a Better Environment
- A Safe City
- What Citizens and Communities can do

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 In the past 5 years the voluntary sector has experienced a challenging scenario of public and other sources of funding being reduced. This reduction includes both grants and contracts for services.

Due to the current funding climate and work being underway but not completed regarding the future of Sheffield City Council's grant aid pot it is recommended that the existing Voluntary Sector Grants Fund agreements are continued in 2016/17 to provide some stability for the organisations funded and time to adapt to a new grants regime.

10. **SCHOOL PLACES IN SHEFFIELD**

10.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families submitted a report making recommendations on the next steps in meeting the pressing need for new primary and secondary school places in the North East and the South West of the City following public consultation. It included a summary of the response to consultation, an appraisal of the options, and proposals for the next stage.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet authorises the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, and where necessary in consultation with the Executive Director, Place to take all necessary steps, including bringing forward the necessary capital approval submissions to Cabinet, to:

- (i) commission a new 11-18 school on the car park area of the former Bannerdale site as described in the report;
- (ii) support the temporary expansion of Silverdale to provide an additional 60 secondary school places in 2016/17 and 2017/18 as set out in the report;
- (iii) undertake a 4-week consultation on a proposal to expand Ecclesall Infant School to become a through primary school offering 90 places per year as set out in the report; and
- (iv) commission a new 2-18 school on the former Pye Bank School site as described in the report.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposals put forward in this report represent the best outcomes when balancing the various priorities including: ensuring access to great, inclusive schools in every area of the city, getting value for money, protecting green spaces, and meeting housing needs. This has been thoroughly tested through the consultation and the process of appraising the various options since the consultation.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 The recommended proposals for the provision of school places have been subject to considerable amounts of formative discussion and a formal and extended consultation with schools, parents, and the local community. All original options and new options coming through the consultation have been considered equally through this process. Where new secondary schools have been proposed, the alternative option of expanding existing schools has been fully considered in every aspect and deemed insufficient, unfeasible, or educationally unviable to provide the capacity increase needed across the secondary sector in the programme up to, and beyond, 2020.

10.4.2 The option of doing nothing or delaying delivery of the provision proposed is not feasible. It poses significant risks to the Council in not providing sufficient statutory school places and to parents in not being able to secure a school place for their child.

11. **REVENUE BUDGET 2016/17**

11.1 The Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources submitted a

report providing information to enable the Council to set a budget and determine the Council Tax. The proposals set out in the report provided for a balanced budget to be recommended to Council.

- 11.2 As part of Cabinet's consideration of the joint report, it was noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had met on the morning of 17 February to consider the joint report. In noting both reports the Committee also resolved the following:-

RESOLVED: That this Committee:-

- (i) believes austerity is a political choice, not an economic necessity;
- (ii) believes that Sheffield has been unfairly targeted for cuts by the Government since 2010;
- (iii) condemns the Government for the savage, persistent and unfair cuts it has chosen to impose; and
- (iv) resolves to send this motion and accompanying report to Sheffield Members of Parliament, to underline the ferociousness of the funding situation facing Sheffield City Council.

- 11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 4 March 2016 that:-

- (a) a net Revenue Budget for 2016/17 amounting to £406.492m is approved;
- (b) a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,360.48 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 3.99% (1.99% City Council increase and 2% national arrangement for the social care precept) is approved;
- (c) the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report are approved;
- (d) based on the estimated expenditure level set out in Appendix 3 to this report, it be noted that the amounts shown in part B of Appendix 6 would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2016/17, in accordance with sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (e) it be noted that the section 151 officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, as outlined in Appendix 4 of the report;
- (f) the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area be noted;

- (g) the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2016/17 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 168 be approved;
- (h) the latest 2015/16 budget monitoring position be noted;
- (i) the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the report and the recommendations contained therein be approved;
- (j) the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the report be approved;
- (k) authority is delegated to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;
- (l) the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15 May 2013, and implemented for 2014/15 and 2015/16, be also implemented for 2016/17;
- (m) foregoing an annual increase in the Members' allowances in 2016/17 is approved;
- (n) a Pay Policy for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 8 of the report is approved;
- (o) authority be delegated to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2016/17;
- (p) authority be delegated to the Executive Director, Communities to set – subject to budgetary constraints – a framework of care home & home care fee increases with effect from 1 April 2016; and
- (q) the resolution of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, at its meeting held on 17 February 2016, in consideration of the Revenue Budget 2016/17 report, be supported and this be referred to all Sheffield Members of Parliament and Members of the House of Lords.

12. CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2016/17

- 12.1 The Interim Executive Director, Resources submitted a report setting out the proposed Capital Programme from 2016-17 onwards describing the programmes to be undertaken, listing the projects to be delivered and setting out the context in which it had been compiled.
- 12.2 As part of the Cabinet's consideration of the report it was noted that the Overview

and Scrutiny Management Committee had noted the following recommendations, without amendment, as part of its consideration of the report earlier in the day.

12.3 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 4th March 2016:-

- (a) it notes the specific projects included in the years 2016-17 to 2021-22 programmes included in Appendix 9 to the report, and that Block allocations were included within the programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals would be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (b) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2021-22 as at Appendix 9 to the report; and
- (c) approves the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) policy, outlined in Appendix 4 of the report, such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2016-17 unless explicitly stated, and that further reports would be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process should the receipts position improve.

12.4 **Reasons for Decision**

12.4.1 The proposed projects within the Capital programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield

12.4.2 To formally record the Capital Programme in line with the Council's annual budgetary procedures and gain Member approval for the policy on the management of the Corporate Resource Pool.

12.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.5.1 A number of alternative courses of action are considered as part of the capital approval process undertaken by Officers before decisions are recommended to Members. The recommendations made to Members represent what Officers believe to be the best options available to the Council, in line with Council priorities, given the constraints on funding and the use to which funding is put within the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

13. **REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2015/16 MONTH 9 (AS OF 31/12/15)**

13.1 The Interim Executive Director, Resources submitted a report providing the month 9 monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue and Capital Budget for 2015/16.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the

report on the 2015/16 Revenue Budget position;

- (b) in relation to the Capital Programme:-
 - (i) approves the proposed additions to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 5.1 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 the Capital Programme Group;
 - (ii) approves the proposed variations, deletions and slippages as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report;
 - (iii) approves the acceptance of the grant detailed in Appendix 5.2 of the report;
 - (iv) notes the two variations authorised by Directors under the delegated authority provisions; and
 - (v) and notes the latest position on the Capital Programme.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with the latest position.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 13.4.1 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.