

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## CABINET

### Meeting held 23rd May, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillors Harry Harpham (Deputy Chair), Isobel Bowler, Leigh Bramall, Jackie Drayton, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea and Bryan Lodge

.....

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Julie Dore and Jack Scott.

#### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

#### **3. MINUTES**

3.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2012 were approved as a correct record.

#### **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

4.1 Public Question on Review of Care4you Resources Centres at Hazlehurst and Sevenfields

4.1.1 Mr. Jamie Thompson asked how did the Council plan to recognise the value of the skills/expertise of staff working at the Sevenfields and Hazlehurst Resources Centres if they were de-commissioned?

4.1.2 Mr. Thompson also asked what measures will be in place to ensure the standard of care provided by private sector homes will be of the standard provided currently?

4.1.3 In response Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, stated that the Council applied a whole raft of measures to monitoring the quality of care provided in care homes, including inspections by Council Members and staff and NHS staff. Reports on these inspections were submitted for consideration by the Council's Monitoring Advisory Group, which she chaired and which comprised cross party representation and lay people. Reports from the Group were submitted to the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee. She acknowledged the additional point raised by Mr. Thompson concerning the high rating given by the Care Quality Commission to Sevenfields following an inspection and she added that, if any problems were detected by the Council in private sector homes, they would be the subject of regular monitoring and inspection, with a view to bringing them up

to standard, with the ultimate sanction that placements to such homes would be stopped.

4.2 Public Question on Aerial Upgrade Contract Advert and Charges for Ladders on the Hanover/Lansdowne estate

4.2.1 Mr. Stuart Lapp expressed serious concern that he had not yet received responses to his requests made at Council meetings and through correspondence, in relation to the Aerial Upgrade contract advert for the Hanover/Lansdowne estate and that, if he did not receive a response to his queries in the near future he would refer the matter to the Information Commissioner. In asking his question, Mr Lapp also asked for details of the charges made for ladders under the contract.

4.2.2 Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) responded that his understanding was that, in relation to matters concerning the Aerial Advert, information had been supplied to Mr. Lapp by officers but he would double check this. Councillor Harpham also indicated that Mr Lapp's query regarding the charges for ladders had already been answered.

4.3 Public Question concerning Citizen's Advice Services Centre funding

4.3.1 Mr. Stuart Lapp asked why the Council had withdrawn funding from Citizen's Advice Centres at Chapeltown, Darnall, Manor and Stocksbridge and where could members of the public now access advice services as a result?

4.3.2 Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) indicated that all four Centres had been advised in writing of the Council's proposals and it was the Council's intention to work with them on the future provision of advice services in the light of the proposals. The areas concerned would continue to have access to advice services but this would be through other organisations. It was also intended to submit a report to Cabinet on the future provision of advice services in these areas.

4.4 Public Question on action of South Yorkshire Police

4.4.1 Mr. Saleh Mohamed Ali raised concerns he suggested he had raised many times alleging his persecution and pressure by institutions in Sheffield and appealed to Cabinet to solve his problems commencing with an investigation into why the Police had raided his home?

Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) responded that he would pass on Mr Ali's concerns to the South Yorkshire Police.

**5. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY/REFERRED TO CABINET/COUNCIL**

5.1 The Deputy Chief Executive reported that there had been no items of business called in for scrutiny arising from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2012.

5.2 The Cabinet noted the information reported.

**6. RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

6.1 The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report on Council staff retirements.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That this Cabinet :-

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Years' Service</u>
<b><u>Children, Young People and Families</u></b>		
John Allen	Teacher, Hucklow Primary School	31
Glyn Barrott	Teacher, Meadowhead School	33
Barbara Bryars	Teacher, Hucklow Primary School	39
Jennifer Cross	Teacher, High Storrs School	37
Charles Holden	Teacher, Stradbroke Primary School	36
Anne Holland	Teacher, Meadowhead School	31
Andrea Hughes	MIS Manager, Meadowhead School	22
Lynne Poole	Acting Assistant Headteacher/Teacher, Reignhead Primary School	25
Marie Smith	Deputy Headteacher, Stradbroke Primary School	36
Ian Taylor	Assistant Headteacher, Hatfield Primary School	26
Cath Vincent	Assistant Headteacher, Meadowhead School	34

**Communities**

Peter Allen	Training and Development Consultant	38
-------------	-------------------------------------	----

James Brodie	Support Worker	29
--------------	----------------	----

**Place**

Richard Benson	Geographic Information Officer	37
----------------	--------------------------------	----

Keith Cain	Cemetery Operative	36
------------	--------------------	----

Peter Dyson	Senior Technician, Highway Co-ordination	27
-------------	--	----

David Hume	Bereavement Officer	24
------------	---------------------	----

Alan Hunt	Cemetery Operative	36
-----------	--------------------	----

Keith Long	Group Manager, Building Standards	37
------------	-----------------------------------	----

Peter Mallinder	Principal Engineer	37
-----------------	--------------------	----

Ian Peck	Project Management Practice Manager	29
----------	-------------------------------------	----

Ian Taylor	Head of Design and Project Management	38
------------	---------------------------------------	----

Martin Taylor	Operations Controller - Workshops	40
---------------	-----------------------------------	----

**Resources**

John Plant	Financial Services Manager	31
------------	----------------------------	----

Denise Reynolds	Senior Business Support Officer	36
-----------------	---------------------------------	----

(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.

## 7. EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken by the Cabinet:-

### 7.1. AGENDA ITEM 10: REVIEW OF CARE4YOU RESOURCES CENTRES

7.1.1 The Executive Director, Communities, submitted a report on the joint review carried out by the Council and NHS Sheffield into the future of the Council's two Care4you Resources Centres namely, Hazlehurst at Jordanthorpe and Sevenfields at Wisewood, which were jointly funded by the City Council and NHS Sheffield and provided 42 beds for the re-habilitation of people following a hospital stay. The review had identified a number of options which had included a preferred option to decommission the 42 beds in the current buildings and commission alternative care elsewhere based on current need and demand.

The options available had been the subject of a period of consultation between 6<sup>th</sup> December 2011 and 29<sup>th</sup> February, 2012, which included consideration of the options by the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee, the findings of which were included in the Executive Director's report and which supported the proposal to de-commission the two Resources Centres.

7.1.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet (a) in fully considering the outcome of the consultations and the work of the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee and acknowledging that both the Council and NHS Sheffield will secure appropriate alternative provision from the independent sector, approves action to proceed with the decommissioning of the two Resource Centres namely, Hazlehurst at Jordanthorpe and Sevenfields at Wisewood, and the proposals for the commissioning of alternative care by the end of June 2012 or a date as soon as practical after that date; and

(b) wishes to place on record the fact that it values the staff at the two Resource Centres and further, wishes to convey to staff at the Centres, its appreciation of the high level of expertise and commitment displayed by them during the course of their work.

### 7.1.3 Reasons for Recommendations

- The NHS requires nursed beds for intermediate care which the resource centres do not offer.
- The NHS professional view is that nursed beds are more appropriate for intermediate care where there are qualified nurses on site 24 hours a day. Neither the resource centres nor the City Council can offer this service.
- The City Council buildings are no longer fit for purpose for those people needing intermediate care and are provided at a comparatively high cost.
- Older people, their families and carers have told NHS Sheffield and the City Council that they want to be supported at home or as close to home as possible.

- The City Council and NHS Sheffield have given a commitment to secure alternative services within improved facilities and which will deliver better value for money.
- The requirement for the City Council to make savings whilst also maintaining essential services.

#### 7.1.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- The options appraisal and review considered 6 options and has produced clear conclusions and recommended Option 5. The second preferred option would be to commission intermediate care in a community model, but this does not meet need as well, there is evidence to suggest bed based services are required alongside any community model, additionally it would not provide value for money. The 3<sup>rd</sup> preferred option was to reprovide the current care in new or different buildings, but this does not meet need well, would not resolve the requirement for nursed beds and is likely to increase costs. The 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> preferred options sought to reduce the level of service and this is not the intended outcome or again would not meet the requirement for nursed beds. The least preferred option was no change and this would not meet future needs well, would require significant investment and would not be sustainable in the long term.
- Feedback from consultations suggested a co-operative as a means to deliver the service. It is very difficult to see how this would be able to offer any solution to the need to relocate the services into more suitable buildings, to provide intermediate care within nursing beds and to provide this at less cost than presently. Over the years the council has considered all options for its residential care buildings, including the resource centres, and the cost of refurbishing and creating larger bedrooms with en-suites was always prohibitive. It is more cost effective to secure new build facilities which would be beyond the capability of a cooperative, or to purchase intermediate beds from other providers.

#### 7.2 **AGENDA ITEM 9: COMMUNITY RIGHT TO CHALLENGE – IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCALISM ACT 2011**

- 7.2.1 The Deputy Chief Executive and the Executive Director, Resources, submitted a joint report referring to the provisions of part 5 of the Localism Act which gave community and voluntary sector groups, and employees of the Council the right to challenge the Council on the delivery of certain services. Under the Act, the Council would need to publish timescales and develop an internal policy and process for accepting and reviewing challenges prior to the relevant provisions of the Act coming into force. The process for implementing the provisions would be largely determined by the regulations issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), the final version of which had yet to be issued.

**7.2.2 RESOLVED:** That Cabinet :-

- (a) delegates to the Director of Commercial Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Finance and Resources and Communities and Inclusion, and the Directors of Policy, Partnerships and Research and Legal Services, authority to specify the periods under Part 5, Chapter 2 of the Localism Act 2011 for dealing with Expressions of Interest (EOI) as defined in the Act and Regulations when they come into force; and
- (b) delegates to the Director of Commercial Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Members Finance and Resources and Communities and Inclusion, and the Directors of Policy, Partnerships and Research and Legal Services, authority to agree the internal policy and procedure for considering an EOI.

**7.2.3 Reasons for Decision**

The latest indication from Government is that these provisions will come into force in late May or June, shortly after the Regulations are laid before Parliament. This means that there will not be sufficient time between Regulations being laid and the provisions coming into force for the Regulations to be included within a process and a report to reach Cabinet. The Council needs to be in a position to respond quickly to allow it to set windows when EOI can be submitted, while it develops policy and procedure to respond to those EOI in line with the Act and the associated Regulations

**7.2.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

Approval of the timescales and the process could be referred back to Cabinet.

**7.3 AGENDA ITEM 11: LOWFIELD MYPLACE (U- MIX CENTRE) PROJECT**

7.3.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report containing proposals to progress the Lowfield MyPlace Project (also known as the U - mix Project) for the provision of state of the art youth facilities in the Lowfield which would be funded by the MyPlace Government Programme and other funding sources which would also be used for the operational management of the Project Centre.

**7.3.2 RESOLVED:**

- (a) agrees the allocation of funding from the Youth budgets to the U-Mix Centre Project for the first two years of the Centre's operation, such funding to be up to the levels set out in paragraph 6.3 of the report, and to be used to support running costs including, but not limited to, staffing and management costs referred to in this report;
- (b) notes the proposed contractual arrangements described in paragraph 5.6 of the report and delegates authority to the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for

Children, Young People and Families and the Director of Commercial Services, to appoint through, a process approved by the Director of Commercial Services, a suitable provider by way of a formal agreement on such terms as she considers appropriate to undertake the management of the U-Mix Centre, including the appointment and provision of staff, as described in the report; and

- (c) authorises the Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, to take such further steps to progress the Lowfield project or to safeguard the City Council's interests in relation to it as she shall consider appropriate, including entering into such agreements or arrangements with third parties on such terms as she considers appropriate, and if she considers it necessary, to vary the arrangements for the management of the U-Mix Centre proposed in this report.

### 7.3.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- The City Council has placed significant priority on improving facilities at a local level for children, young people and the wider community. This proposal supports this commitment and provides a real opportunity to improve the local offer available.
- The investment by the City Council of the revenue funding required will provide a secure basis on which to allow the income generation strategy to be realised
- This proposal delivers the requirement of funding bodies that external providers to the Council have a key role in the development and operation of this facility. It also supports the Council's commitment to working in collaboration with external organisations and ensuring that high quality activities and services are secured and provided.
- This proposal seeks to use existing resource within the Children, Young People and Families budget and is not seeking to secure any additional City Council funding.
- Scarce funds need to be utilised effectively and this is best delivered through a joined up approach that engages a range of partners and draws on their expertise and access to additional, external resources.

### 7.3.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- The Council has considered the option of transferring the facility through Trust arrangements with an appropriate organisation/group. However, exploration of this option has concluded that this would require the implementation of a longer term project to establish a robust, sustainable arrangement. The requirements of funders also mean that the operation of the facility must be prioritised. Further work in relation to this option could continue alongside the operational plans for the facility.



- A further consideration has explored the establishment of the facility under direct Council management and operation. This option has been rejected as it will not achieve the added value provided through establishing the facility through an external provider. External, independent providers have opportunities to apply for and secure funding sources not accessible to local authorities and provide significant added value to Council services in this way. In addition, the current funding bodies require the engagement of external providers as key to the development and operation of the facility.
- The proposed approach set out in paragraph 5 of this paper has therefore been established as the preferred option that will bring the most value to the establishment of the facility.

#### 7.4 **AGENDA ITEM 12: LEARNING PROVISION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AND ADULTS IN SHEFFIELD**

7.4.1 The Executive Director, Children, Young People and Families, submitted a report containing proposals for the creation of a new commissioning framework that would allow the local authority to draw on a network of local providers to deliver tailored programmes to young people and adult learners across the City. The report sought approval to use a proportion of the funding awarded annually to the City Council by the Young People's Learning Agency and the Skills Funding Agency to secure learning opportunities for 16-19 year olds and adult learners from a quality assured network of local providers selected through tender.

7.4.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet agrees to:-

- (a) the creation of a commissioning framework that allows for a more responsive, flexible and innovative approach to matching teenage and adult learners to the provision that best meets their needs;
- (b) the tendering, through the framework, of a proportion of the Adult Safeguarded Learning funding awarded to the City Council to better meet the needs of adult learners;
- (c) the tendering, through the framework, of a proportion of the Employer Responsive (ER) and Learner Responsive(LR) funds to better meet the needs of both teenage and adult learners in their local communities;
- (d) the delegation to the Assistant Director of Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities – Family and Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member, Children, Young People and Families, and the Directors of Finance and Legal, to award the contracts and to determine the terms and conditions upon which the contracts will be awarded; and
- (e) the delegation to the Assistant Director of Lifelong Learning, Skills and Communities – Family and Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member, Children, Young People and Families, the ability to do anything

which they feel is necessary to achieve the outcomes outlined in the report.

#### 7.4.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- The national picture for adult learning is changing and there is a projected move towards developing the activities of local community involvement in adult learning. Offering contracts to local organisations and supporting them to build capacity and expertise will enable them to be better prepared for this. It will also help to strengthen their ability to secure other sources of external funding for education and training.
- The City also needs a more flexible, varied, and easily accessible programme of learning for vulnerable and disadvantaged young people that makes us better able to further reduce the Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETS) cohort and to meet the challenges associated with the Raising of the Age of Participation to 18 by 2015. A commissioning framework through which quality assured partners are able to respond rapidly, reach into communities and engage potential learners in innovative ways will contribute to this agenda.

#### 7.4.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- Retain direct delivery of all adult and community learning by the City Council. This is in direct conflict with the national direction of travel to localise responsibility for the planning and delivery through Community Learning Trusts.
- Retain direct delivery of the ER and LR funding streams exclusively through the City Council's own learning centres. This would militate against the development of a more flexible and diverse provider base across the city that is, in some cases, better placed to meet the needs of the most vulnerable learners.

### 7.5 **AGENDA ITEM 13: TRANSFORMING SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH DEMENTIA LIVING AT HOME**

7.5.1 The Executive Director, Communities, submitted a report setting out the Council's approach for supporting people with dementia living at home including proposals for the commissioning of an information and advice service in order to meet the requirements attached to Government funding.

#### 7.5.2 **RESOLVED:**

- (a) confirms its commitment to people with dementia and the families, communities and organisations who support them;
- (b) endorses the strategic approach to addressing the changing aspirations and the environment in which support is delivered, including the intention to make Sheffield a dementia friendly City;

- (c) authorises a major involvement exercise with those affected by dementia to ensure that change fully reflects their views with a further report on the outcome being brought back to Cabinet for consideration;
- (d) agrees to establish an Advisory Group who will support officers undertaking the involvement exercise; and
- (e) agrees, in advance of the wider discussions, to develop proposals for the commissioning of an information, advice and support service.

### **7.5.3 Reasons for Recommendations**

- The growing number of people with dementia represents a significant issue for the City. The expectation for most people with dementia is to remain at home as long as possible.
- The existing support arrangements will not meet the increase in demand or the changing expectations of people with dementia.
- The existing support arrangements will not meet the increase in demand or the changing expectations of people with dementia.
- To help understand how best to develop services, agreement is being sought to involve people and organisations affected by dementia.
- In order to comply with the requirements attached to Government funding, Cabinet is asked to approve plans to commission an information and advice service in advance of the wider discussion.

### **7.5.4 Alternatives considered and Rejected**

No alternatives were put forward or considered to be appropriate in the circumstances

This page is intentionally left blank