

Cabinet

Meeting held 17 July 2019

**PRESENT:** Councillors Olivia Blake, Lewis Dagnall, Bob Johnson, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, George Lindars-Hammond, Abtisam Mohamed and Paul Wood

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from the Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, and Councillor Jackie Drayton.

**2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

2.1 The Chair (Councillor Olivia Blake) reported that the appendix to the report at agenda item 14 (See minute 13 below) (Disposal of Lease for Parkwood Springs Leisure Destination) was not available to the public and press because it contained exempt information described in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person. Accordingly, if the content of the appendix was to be discussed, the public and press would be excluded from the meeting.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 Councillor Mazher Iqbal declared a personal interest in agenda item 11 (Sheffield Olympic Legacy Park) (See minute 10 below) as he would shortly be appointed as a Board Member of the Olympic Legacy Park.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee, held on 19 June 2019, were approved as a correct record.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 Public Question in respect of Disposal of Assets

5.1.1 Mike Hodson commented that a Sheffield Telegraph article on 13 June 2019 listed a number of assets sold by the Council between 2016 and 2018, with the amounts of money realised by each sale. Two of the sites sold were Abbeydale Grange School site and the Bannerdale Centre site, both off Abbeydale Road. The Abbeydale Grange site was listed as realising £741,000 in 2016 and the Bannerdale Centre site realised £2.3 million in 2018. Both these sites were in the South West area of the City, within 200m of each other; they were both about the same size and both had planning permission for approximately the same number of houses. Surprisingly, in Mr Hodson's view, the Abbeydale Grange site was sold

Freehold, whereas the Bannerdale Centre site was sold Leasehold, which would normally realise smaller sale prices.

- 5.1.2 Mr Hodson therefore asked could the Cabinet Member explain the huge difference in the sale prices for these two sites, in view of their significant similarities? Could they also confirm that, in the Abbeydale Grange case, the Council accepted a drop in the sale price of £2.9 million, exactly the same amount that the Council was due from the developer, Avant Homes, for their required contribution to the provision of affordable housing under the Council's planning policies which stood at 30% of the likely sale profits?
- 5.1.3 Mr Hodson further asked could the Cabinet Member also confirm that, in both cases, the independent valuer recommended that the developers could afford larger contributions than were actually made, with a net loss to the Council of £3.6 million? In the case of Abbeydale Grange, the recommendation was for a £2.9 million (22%) contribution, whereas Avant Homes effectively paid nothing; and there are no affordable homes on the development. In the case of the Bannerdale Centre, the recommendation was for a £1.2 million (27.5%) contribution, whereas Barratt Homes actually contributed only £500,000 (23%), a loss of £720,000 with only 11 affordable homes on-site.
- 5.1.4 Mr Hodson then asked could the Cabinet Member also confirm that almost all of the cash contributions made by developers in the South and West of the City towards the provision of affordable housing were spent in other areas? Could they explain how this was reconciled with their planning policy aspiring to provide such affordable housing in all areas of the City, so as to avoid transforming the southern and western areas of the City into executive ghettos?
- 5.1.5 Councillor Olivia Blake, Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance, responded that the valuations had been given by two independent valuers. As a result of the first valuation, the Council commissioned a second independent valuation which confirmed the first valuation.
- 5.1.6 The Council traditionally sold properties leasehold. However, in 2017/18 the Government announced proposals which prevented the Council from selling properties leasehold moving forward. This was why the Bannerdale Centre was sold as freehold. It was difficult to make comparisons between sites, which was why the Council obtained a valuation on each property.
- 5.1.7 Councillor Bob Johnson, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, added that, as far as he was aware, money had not been distributed to other areas. Section 106 money was negotiated with developers.

## 5.2 Public Question in respect of Birley Spa

- 5.2.1 Nigel Slack commented that the last he had heard in respect of Birley Spa was that the Friends of Birley Spa had worked diligently with local Councillors to get agreement to them being able to fundraise for the building and secure its ownership within the community and preserve this unique asset for the City.

- 5.2.2 Mr Slack added that a recent story in the Sheffield Star newspaper had thrown all this into doubt, suggesting that the Council had taken steps to place the building on the market within a few weeks and before the Friends of Birley Spa had received any practical support or encouragement from the Council. This story seemed to take both local Councillors and the City Council's own Heritage Champion by surprise.
- 5.2.3 Mr Slack therefore asked will the Friends of Birley Spa be given the material support they need to undertake fundraising activities? Where does the sum of £200,000 come from and why is this being demanded in this way? How will selling the building to a developer address the issues of the 900 year old woodland and the nature reserve or the public access to that woodland? Was this a case of Property Services failing to support the potential for community ownership through what might seem to be deliberate obstruction of a committed friends group?
- 5.2.4 Councillor Paul Wood, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, stated that he was pleased that Mr Slack had asked this question as there had been a lot of misleading information in the public domain. When the building was originally put up for sale, local Ward Councillors held discussion with the local community group. As a historic building it was a priority of the Council to preserve this.
- 5.2.5 Councillor Wood added that, once the community group had submitted their bid, all other bids were suspended. The local community group then held a meeting with Clive Betts M.P. who stated that the group needed to produce a business plan to ensure viability in the future.
- 5.2.6 The two biggest problems with the building were that work on the roof was needed (and work underpinning) to prevent sinking and part of the upstairs floor had collapsed which was a security risk. All the windows needed replacing and there was damp damage. The Co-operative party involved looked into the property and had surveyors value the property which was why there were two different figures in the public domain.
- 5.2.7 Councillor Wood further commented that, at the first meeting at the site with the community group, which Councillors Jim Steinke and Denise Fox attended, the community group were informed that they may need additional funding for the building. A number of attempts had been made to obtain funding but this had not been achieved. A meeting with the group was then arranged at the Town Hall and the Group's business plan was explored. Unfortunately, this plan had no long term viability. The meeting was adjourned and Councillor Wood informed the group his opinion on how the building could be preserved.
- 5.2.8 The group then presented a further plan but this had the same viability issues. Councillor Wood made it clear to the group that the Council was not seeking a big capital receipt. What was needed was a viable plan to repair and run the building. At this stage the Council informed the group they would ask if the the sale could be delayed for 3 months to enable them to establish a viable plan for the building. The Council did not give any deadlines to the group at the last minute, as had been suggested.

- 5.2.9 Councillor Wood added that the guttering needed to be repaired before the winter and therefore the group were asked for a response within 7 weeks. Another meeting had been held with the group last Sunday and it was clear that some members of the group were hoping that the Council will just give over the building to the group and let them run it how they wish which, he suggested, would be totally irresponsible.
- 5.2.10 The group had been given a deadline of August 10 to produce a viable plan. Nothing had been ruled out at this stage. If all else failed and bidding was reopened the Council would insist any successful bids needed to have community access on the bottom floor of the building. Councillor Wood was proud of how the Council had dealt with the situation and the community group concerned had been provided with a great deal of support.

### 5.3 Public Question in respect of the Street Tree Strategy

- 5.3.1 Paul Brooke commented that he welcomed the report on the agenda for the meeting in relation to the Street Tree Strategy but took issue with some of the detail in the report. In paragraph 1.2.3 it stated that 'The above statistics demonstrate that the new approach adopted, and the additional funding being made available by Amey for bespoke solutions, is having a significant impact.' This explains that Amey were providing funding only for the 26 bespoke solutions and that was Sheffield Tree Action Groups (STAG) understanding. STAG had photographic evidence of some of the ordinary engineering solutions (that they were told were in the contract price) that had been used to retain 191 trees that were to be felled as a last resort. Could the Cabinet Member please explain what new solutions Amey were resorting to and applying to these trees?
- 5.3.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall, Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, thanked tree campaigners for attending the meeting and welcomed the progress that had been made. Amey were now undertaking work that had previously been considered unviable which they had now decided they could accommodate the cost for, as well as taking on the risk.

### 5.4 Public Question in respect of Street Trees

- 5.4.1 Paul Brooke stated that, in the Council's press release of 10 July 2019, it stated that there had been 'adjustments to the Council's specification around some trees'. STAG were told in the mediated talks with the Council that this was only to allow a temporary retention of trees to phase their felling over a longer period.
- 5.4.2 Mr Brooke added that the Council's press release stated that 191 trees will be retained indefinitely. Will the Council make public the specification changes it has agreed with Amey and any associated documentation so the public can see what, when and how the Council made this change?
- 5.4.3 Councillor Lewis Dagnall responded that he wished for the trees referred to by Mr Brooke to be retained and this would be assessed on an ongoing basis. He hoped that they could be retained indefinitely. The Council met on a monthly basis with

the Co-Chairs of STAG and this presented plenty of opportunities to receive information in due course.

5.5 Public Question in respect of Street Trees

5.5.1 Shelley Cockayne commented that, in the Joint Position Statement, the Council committed to holding a review after an initial phase of joint investigations and that this would be published so that lessons could be learned and applied to the remaining trees. The Council also agreed that the assessment/investigations would be joint. Could the Council explain why none of the STAG evidence had been used in the Council's decision making and no review had taken place despite assuring the Bishop of Sheffield it would be done by the end of June?

5.5.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall replied that the Council was in discussion with STAG as to how to enact both of the issues referred to by Ms. Cockayne.

5.6 Public Question in respect of Court Injunction

5.6.1 Carole Sutherland asked will the Cabinet Member expand his personal apology to workers, campaigners and residents to that of an apology on behalf of the Cabinet and confirm now that the Council no longer requires an injunction and will not seek to extend it?

5.6.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall stated that he had a great desire for an injunction not to be needed in order to carry out the Council's policies. The Council was working with campaigners and residents to try and work towards a position where the injunction could be relaxed. It was clear that the situation had come to an impasse and that change was needed and Councillor Dagnall was now glad that the Council and campaigners were working together collaboratively to chart a different course forward.

5.7 Public Question in respect of the Independent Tree Panel

5.7.1 Rebecca Hammond commented that the evidence and data behind the Cabinet report to be discussed at today's meeting showed that Council officers ignored and overturned their own Independent Tree Panel (ITP) advice to retain trees using the engineering solutions available and opted instead to believe what Amey said at face value. Given that Amey were now doing what the ITP advised in many cases, will the Cabinet Member now accept that an inquiry into the gross waste of funds committed under the watch of the Council's Chief Executive was overdue?

5.7.2 Councillor Olivia Blake commented that she had written to STAG today and her response to this question was outlined in that letter. Cllr Blake commented that this had been discussed through the mediated process and the Council was not convinced that this was valid at that time. She did not feel that the call for an inquiry was valid. She was happy to discuss any outstanding issues but did not believe the Cabinet meeting was the appropriate forum to discuss the issue of an inquiry and this should be discussed through the mediated process.

5.7.3 Councillor Dagnall added that the ITP was an attempt to move things forward but he did not believe the approach of analysing trees on a tree by tree basis had been successful.

5.8 Public Question in respect of Tree Campaigners

5.8.1 David Dilner asked will the Cabinet categorically state on record that accusations made against tree campaigners did not emanate from Sheffield City Council officers and/or elected representatives?

5.8.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall responded that Cabinet was meeting today to discuss the report on the agenda and welcome the progress that had been made in discussions with tree campaigners. He now wanted to look to the future and how the differences in the past could be put behind us and he thanked tree campaigners that the situation had got to a point where the report on the agenda for this meeting had been established.

5.9 Public Question in respect of Tree Felling

5.9.1 Justin Buxton commented that, in Autumn 2017, he had prevented the felling of a street tree at 45 Willowdale Crescent. Would the Council therefore wish to take me to Court and seek my imprisonment?

5.9.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall responded that the Cabinet meeting was not the forum to discuss individual legal cases.

5.10 Public Question in respect of Legal Issues

5.10.1 Benoit Compin referred to a legal case against him regarding tree felling and asked if the Council would work with him to resolve this issue?

5.10.2 Councillor Olivia Blake responded that Mr Compin would receive a written response.

5.11 Public Question in respect of a Social Services Case

5.11.1 Alan Savoury asked why the Council had kept his wife in care for the last 7 years at a cost of between £205-210,000. How could this be justified?

5.11.2 Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, commented that he did not have specific details of Mr Savoury's case but he would look into it as a matter of urgency.

5.11.3 Councillor Olivia Blake added that the demands on the social care budget had increased massively in recent years. The Council had committed to using some of its reserves this year to cover the cost.

5.12 Public Question in respect of Leadership

5.12.1 Russell Johnson asked, in light of recent events, was it time for the Leader to step

aside in favour of modern governance that fully exploited the talent and energy of the 74 Members, of all parties, not in the Cabinet?

5.12.2 Councillor Olivia Blake responded that a debate had recently taken place at Full Council into the governance model at the Council and this would be further examined over a 6 month period. Councillor Blake disagreed with Mr Johnson over his views on the leadership of the Council.

5.13 Public Question in respect of the Streets Ahead Contract

5.13.1 Russell Johnson commented that he noted that the Council had continued with its Streets Ahead PFI contract despite dissatisfaction from some members of the public with the contract delivery. One of the complaints amongst some members of the public was Amey's breach of the requirement on the size of sapling trees. Why was the Council apparently unaware of this, or, if they were aware, were they not holding Amey to account?

5.13.2 Councillor Lewis Dagnall responded that the Council did hold Amey to account. The Council made appropriate performance deductions, where appropriate, and Amey did make alterations where necessary. The Council aimed to unpick all outsourcing contracts. However, due to the cost Councillor Dagnall did not think it appropriate to bring the Council out of some contracts due to the cost.

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

6.1 It was noted that there had been no items called-in for Scrutiny since the last meeting of the Cabinet.

**7. RETIREMENT OF STAFF**

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

7.2 **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>Place</u></b>		
Paul Billington	Director of Culture and Environment	35
Gail Parker	Senior Housing Officer, Neighbourhood Services	29
Stephen Parker	Financial Services Manager, Neighbourhood Services	35

## **People Services**

Neil Cadman                      Teacher of Science, Newfield                      37  
School

(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. DEVELOPING THE SHEFFIELD STREET TREE STRATEGY**

8.1        The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report updating Cabinet on the steps taken since the Council issued the Street Trees Joint Position Statement and adopted the Sheffield Trees and Woodlands Strategy in December 2018 and to seek endorsement for the proposed process and timescales for developing a new Street Tree Strategy.

8.2        **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

(a)        notes and endorses the positive progress made following the issue of the Street Trees Joint Position Statement and the adoption of the Sheffield Trees and Woodlands Strategy in December 2018 including:

- the establishment of the Street Tree Strategy development group, including the appointment of Liz Ballard as its chair; and
- the adoption of the new joint inspection and assessment process for street trees.

(b)        agrees to receive a draft of the Street Tree Strategy for consideration in January 2020; and

(c)        notes the recommendations made by Amey to the Council in respect of the trees assessed to date as part of the new process, and advocates the continuation of this approach for future tranches.

## **8.3 Reasons for Decision**

8.3.1      It is considered that the approach set out in the report will enable the Council to make good on the commitments it has made in the Joint Position Statement and the Trees and Woodlands Strategy. It is also felt that the approach being taken by Amey that Cabinet are being asked to advocate continues to represent an acceptable balance between the benefits of mature street trees and the need to maintain the highway programme for the benefit of all Sheffield communities without additional expenditure on the part of the Council.

## **8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

8.4.1      The only other options that are open to Cabinet are to reject the outcomes of the



new approach and to revert to the previously agreed policy for the street tree element of the Streets Ahead programme. It is considered that this would not be in line with the commitments set out in the Joint Position Statement agreed with Sheffield Tree Action Groups (STAG) members, and would be likely to result in substantial loss of trust for the Authority, as well as placing the successful completion of the Streets Ahead programme in significant doubt.

- 8.4.2 Similarly, Cabinet could decide not to endorse the approach to the development of the Street Tree Strategy and to rely on the existing Five Year Tree Management Strategy (produced by Amey) and the Council's current Highway Tree Replacement Policy. This would also be out of line with the commitments set out in the Joint Position Statement and the Trees and Woodlands Strategy agreed by Cabinet in December 2018.

## **9. YOUNG PEOPLE'S SUBSTANCE MISUSE SERVICE**

- 9.1 The Interim Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report setting out the proposed approach to recommissioning drug and alcohol treatment and support services for children and young people aged 10 to 18 in Sheffield separate to, and alongside, the adult treatment service as part of an all age approach. The current contract ends on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and falls within the Council's public health duties.

- 9.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposal to recommission young people's substance misuse services as set out in the report, to secure services for the support and treatment for the children and young people of Sheffield with substance use needs; and
- (b) delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning, Learning and Inclusion, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, to agree the final procurement strategy and approve a contract award following the tender process.

### **9.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 Good quality drug and alcohol support services are essential to help individuals turn their lives around and build stronger families and communities in Sheffield.
- 9.3.2 The Council has a duty to provide drug and alcohol treatment and support services for the people of Sheffield. The Council is not best placed to deliver these required services, so recommissioning is recommended.
- 9.3.3 The current legal contractual arrangements in place for both adult and young people services expire on 31 March 2020. This process will ensure continuity of aligned services, with improved access and transitions, to deliver against the Drug Strategy 2018-2022.

9.3.4 The service will be based on local need and trend analysis, and performance data for current service provision will inform where change and improvement is needed for the forthcoming contract period.

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

9.4.1 The Young People Substance Misuse Service has been provided by the Council for 15 years and is a key plank of the local Drug Strategy. The current contract cannot be extended and the opportunity is to recommission the service in line with the adult substance misuse service as part of an all age approach.

9.4.2 Another option would be for the Council to deliver the service in house; this has been rejected for a number of reasons. Firstly, the service model involves a significant element of clinical expertise. Secondly, the Council has no experience of delivering the service, and there is a well-developed market of qualified and experienced potential providers. Finally, the Council has no systems in place for clinical supervision of a workforce, licences to hold medication, or provision to manage safe prescribing, and the cost of making the necessary arrangements would be disproportionately high and poor value for money when existing, fit for purpose options exist in the market.

### 10. **SHEFFIELD OLYMPIC LEGACY PARK**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report providing an update on the future direction of the Sheffield Olympic Legacy Park (SOLP), including future governance arrangements, role of wider stakeholders, funding, and options for a private sector development partner. An appendix showing a Plan for the Park was also circulated to Members at the meeting.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet;

- (a) notes the progress made at Sheffield Olympic Legacy Park (SOLP) to date;
- (b) confirms the expanded vision and geographical reach of an extended SOLP, as set out in the report and at Appendix 1 now circulated at this meeting;
- (c) approves the retainment of Legacy Park Limited (LPL) as the special purpose vehicle charged with driving forward delivery of SOLP on the basis and implications as set out in this report;
- (d) confirms the role and remit of LPL as set out in the report, including reporting arrangements;
- (e) approves up to £150,000 per annum for 3 years from the Council's Corporate Investment Fund to cover underwriting risk in support of operations associated with SOLP;

- (f) in respect of the current financial year, approves the underwriting of up to £150k of current operating costs but work with LPL to move to a capped contribution of £80k by December;
- (g) approves the principle of a Memorandum of Understanding, as set out at section 2 of the report, designed to oversee the relationship between Sheffield City Council and LPL;
- (h) approves the negotiation with Scarborough International Property Limited as preferred development partner in order to drive forward the commercial development of SOLP, working in conjunction with Sheffield City Council and wider SOLP partners, with terms to be agreed by the Executive Director, Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance, Cabinet Member for Business and Investment, and Director of Legal and Governance; and
- (i) commissions LPL and City Council officers to produce annual reports on the impact of SOLP.

### 10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 In order to continue and expand the economic and social benefits to the city, it is recommended to confirm an expanded vision for SOLP, including retaining the special purpose vehicle LPL.
- 10.3.2 In order to ensure strong governance and democratic accountability, it is recommended that a Memorandum of Understanding is put in place to oversee the relationship between SCC and LPL.
- 10.3.3 In order to accelerate the commercial development of SOLP, it is recommended the Council negotiates with Scarborough International Property Limited as preferred development partner.

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

- 10.4.1 The main broad alternative options for the strategic direction of SOLP are as follows:-

<b>Option</b>	<b>Analysis</b>
SCC to withdraw from LPL and cease its involvement in SOLP	This would jeopardise SOLP's success to date and represent a major loss to the city's economic fortunes. As SOLP is on Council land, this is not only not a viable option, it would also damage the Council commercially and its reputation.
Not extend SOLP and cap the project at its current geographic extent.	As set out in this report, there is the opportunity and appetite from partners and to expand the impact of SOLP by increasing its size and reach.
End LPL as a stand-alone company and deliver SOLP	As set out in this report, this would not generate a significant saving to the Council as dedicated delivery

in-house.	capacity would still be needed, but it would risk a significant loss of momentum and effectiveness. On the understanding that the LPL will involve other partners, this report recommends continuing with LPL.
Transfer land and assets to LPL	This would mean SCC lose control of the decision making process. As set out in this report, it is essential that the Council seeks to recoup as much of the investment made to date in OLP as possible. LPL acting as the single point of contact for investment enquiries, but SCC retaining control of assets is felt to be the best way of achieving this.  It is unlikely to meet the legal requirements for achieving best consideration.
Pursue SOLP without an expanded set of partners	SOLP is a partnership of public and private sector bodies. No one institution could deliver the research and development, land, commercial and community elements of SOLP alone.
Do not appoint a private sector development partner	Would mean either no further expansion was likely or that the public sector would bear the up front development costs and risks.
Procure private sector development partner	Would mean lengthy process, delaying future development and potentially losing the only developer who has shown interest in developing SOLP future phases.  Would provide a competitive process if there were more bidders and allow the Council to have more control over development.

## 11. MONTH 2 CAPITAL APPROVALS

11.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme, as brought forward in Month 2 2019/20.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) approves the proposed additions and variations to the Capital Programme listed in Appendix 1 of the report, including the procurement strategies and delegates authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services or nominated Officer, as appropriate, to award the necessary contracts;
- (b) approves the acceptance of accountable body status of the grant funding detailed at Appendix 2 of the report; and
- (c) approves the making of grants to third parties as detailed at Appendix 2a of the report.

**11.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.
- 11.3.2 To formally record changes to the Capital Programme and gain Member approval for changes in line with Financial Regulations and to reset the Capital Programme in line with latest information.
- 11.3.3 Obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

**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 2019/20 - AS AT 31 MAY 2019**

- 12.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing the outturn monitoring statement on the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme as at the end of Month 2, 2019/20.

**12.2 RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the updated information and management actions provided by the report and the attached appendix on the 2019/20 Revenue Budget Outturn; and
- (b) in relation to the Capital Programme, notes the forecast outturn position, as outlined in Appendix 2 of the report.

**12.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 12.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget and the Capital Programme.

**12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 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.

### **13. DISPOSAL OF LEASE FOR PARKWOOD SPRINGS LEISURE DESTINATION**

13.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report seeking authority to enter into an Agreement For Lease (AFL) with Extreme Destinations Limited for Sheffield City Council's land interests at the former Parkwood Springs Ski Village and adjoining land, to enable redevelopment of this prominent and derelict site as an outdoor leisure destination.

13.2 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet:-

- (a) delegates authority to the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Executive Director, Resources, to agree terms for the disposal of the land, including any reasonable variations to the boundaries as required, and authorises the Director of Legal and Governance to complete all necessary legal documentation and notices in order to complete the disposal, subject to no objections being received to the open space notice; and
- (b) declares the hatched land, as outlined in Appendix C of the report, surplus to requirements.

#### **13.3 Reasons for Decision**

##### **13.3.1 Preferred option – Proceed with the AfL with Extreme Leisure Destinations**

This approach passes the commercial and financial risk of the development and design work to the developer. Safeguards are built into the Agreement for Lease to commit the developer to timely delivery and ensure the Council retains control should the developer fail to make significant progress.

13.3.2 Entering into the AfL with Extreme Leisure Destinations will enable detailed work to begin on development of the scheme whilst protecting the Council's interests. This represents an important step in realising the vision set out in the Parkwood Masterplan and achieving the benefits for local communities and the people of Sheffield. The AfL enables SCC to pass commercial risk to the developer through a traditional landowner-developer relationship, with principal risks managed by Extreme.

#### **13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

##### **13.4.1 Do nothing – Council retain site**

- Nil impact on Council's resource capacity to deliver redevelopment.
- Fails to deliver on the Council's Outdoor City Economic Strategy.
- Leaves a prominent strategic site derelict and unviable for redevelopment by the market, whilst at the same time vulnerable to continued anti-social

behaviour, vandalism and arson, with an ongoing maintenance cost and liability to the Council in the long term.

- Does not assist the Council any further to market the site anew if current development partnership was not successful.

13.4.2 *Council carries out improvement/infrastructure works and then re-markets the site*

- The Council could seek to enhance the value of the land and deliverability/viability by carrying out improvement/infrastructure works prior to release/disposal (such as works to the access road and improvements to drainage) before re-marketing the site.
- There is no certainty of securing a developer to deliver the economic aspirations and outcomes expected from the site or guarantee that a significantly improved market rate will be achieved.

13.4.3 *Council retains the site and undertakes the development itself*

- The Council could develop, and operate or seek an operator for a leisure destination.
- This approach would require significant resource and funding and, as set out in the report, the viability and risk associated with developments of this nature can be marginal.
- At this point in time this approach would expose the Council to undue commercial and financial risk.

This page is intentionally left blank