

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet

Meeting held 17 June 2020

(NOTE: This meeting was held as a remote meeting in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.)

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Dore (Chair), Jackie Drayton, Terry Fox, Mazher Iqbal, Bob Johnson, Mark Jones, Mary Lea, George Lindars-Hammond, Abtisam Mohamed and Paul Wood

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. All members of the Cabinet were present at the meeting.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. BLACK LIVES MATTER

4.1 The Chair and Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) stated that the Council was shocked and deeply saddened by the recent killing of George Floyd in America and the circumstances surrounding his death. In terms of a response in Sheffield, a number of individuals and organisations had come together, particularly to fight for change in terms of both the events in America, and also in connection with wider issues of racial equality in the City and wider society as a whole. Councillor Dore stated that it was the view of the Cabinet that racism, in any form, had absolutely no place in our society, and the City remained rightly proud of its multi-cultural communities that make the City so vibrant and diverse. No one should ever have to face discrimination because of the colour of their skin, and the majority of Sheffield residents stand in unity against racism in any sort at all times. She stated that these views now needed to be backed up by real actions, which were required to change the injustices and inequalities that still existed today. Councillor Dore stated that Councillor Abtisam Mohamed (Cabinet Member for Education and Skills) had been asked to lead on the creation of a Sheffield Race Equality Commission, which would look across the City's key anchor institutions in order to understand institutional discrimination and racial equality, and further, make recommendations regarding what measures could be taken to address these issues. By working with the Black, Asian, Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities, this would draw on experiences and voices in those communities, as

well as the representations of key anchor institutions in Sheffield. Councillor Dore stressed that this was a crucial piece of work for the City, and presented a major opportunity for all major institutions and organisations to join together to show their commitment to change, and to address the racial inequalities and disparities which, unfortunately, still prevailed in our City, and wider society today. The Council wanted to demonstrate its commitment to take the actions needed to make long-standing change, and the creation of the Commission was an important step, alongside all the important work undertaken by many groups and organisations, over a very long period, who had demonstrated a tremendous effort and commitment to tackle racial inequality. It was important, as a City, that we valued and recognised all their work, and built on this.

- 4.2 Councillor Abtisam Mohamed stated that a huge amount of progress had been made to tackle racial inequality over the years, but there was still so much more work to be done to ensure fair and equitable treatment for all individuals in the City. The potential of the work of the Commission had been made clear to all such individuals, and it had been decided that any discussions must avoid superficial debates or quick fixes. In order to achieve this, all involved must have the commitment, and progress must be made at the right pace, and on a long-term basis, if we wanted to see real and lasting structural change in the City. Councillor Mohamed stated that she understood the frustrations of, and concerns raised by, many individuals in communities in the City, and that everyone needed to move forward together to address these deep-rooted, critical issues, that adversely affected a number of our communities. The issue was bigger than any one person or organisation and, for this reason, it was important that views from across the political spectrum were invited. For this reason, there would be cross-party representation on the Commission. In view of the potential wide scope of the inquiry, it was envisaged that the Commission would prioritise a number of issues for its consideration, and would make recommendations based on its findings. The findings would then be monitored rigorously as change must be driven at a local level to ensure the creation of a more tolerant, equal City, where racial disparities were acknowledged and addressed. Councillor Mohamed concluded by stating that there may be difficult conversations going forward, but they must be heard and, more importantly, addressed. There would be a further statement on progress in respect of the Commission in the coming weeks, and further details would be provided at that time.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Petition Regarding Road Safety on Town End Road

- 5.1.1 Jeff Wager presented a petition, containing 62 signatures, requesting the Council to install speed cameras immediately along Town End Road.
- 5.1.2 Mr Wager stated that he had witnessed vehicles regularly exceeding the speed limit on the road, often up to 70 mph on a 30 mph road, which he viewed as totally unacceptable. The majority of the 62 people who signed the petition lived within the community, and were requesting action as a matter of urgency as they considered a serious accident was waiting to happen.

5.1.3 In response, Councillor Bob Johnson (Cabinet Member for Transport and Development) stated that the South Yorkshire Safety Camera Partnership was the responsible body for making decisions as to where speed cameras could be installed but, in the meantime, he would request officers to check accident statistics at this location. He stated that he had already been informed of the residents' concerns, and indicated that there could be a potential for signage, road humps or build outs, which would hopefully encourage drivers to slow down. Councillor Johnson stated that he would report the receipt of the petition to the Partnership, and send them Mr Wager's contact details, whilst also speaking to local Ward Councillors regarding the possibility of arranging a site visit, to which Mr Wager would be invited to attend.

5.2 Petition Requesting That Sheffield Libraries Be Saved

5.2.1 The Cabinet received a petition, organised by Matt Smith and containing 127 signatures, requesting that Sheffield Libraries be saved.

5.2.2 Paul Robinson (Democratic Services) read out the details of the petition, at Mr Smith's request, indicating that the petitioners were requesting the Council to abolish volunteer libraries, and bring back all 28 city libraries back under the management of Sheffield Libraries, with them being run by Council library staff. The petition was also requesting the immediate implementation of the funding allocated to the Central Library for essential repairs, to abolish library fines, to study options to apply for external funding to renovate and, in the case of the last two, reopen and re-staff the Central, Tinsley Carnegie and Walkley libraries.

5.2.3 Mr Smith's statement indicated that library use in Sheffield continued to decline overall and was a victim of a fragmented, and severely reduced, service delivery model. In addition, transfer to volunteers had seen funding become more transient, and the individual collection of books at Sheffield volunteer libraries not being available on the main Sheffield Libraries catalogue. He indicated that Leeds, a similar size city to Sheffield, had over 30 libraries, still run by Council library staff, many of which were even open Sundays, and over the Christmas holidays. This was despite Leeds having suffered similar cuts to Sheffield under austerity. The Save Libraries petition demanded that Sheffield Libraries take back all 16 volunteer-run branch libraries under Council control, that library fines be abolished and that efforts be made to apply for funding to restore Central, Walkley Carnegie and Tinsley Carnegie libraries to their former glory.

5.2.4 In response, Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure) stated that there had been a decline in library use nationally and in Sheffield over a number of years. Since 2014, there had been approximately 900,000 loans a year from Council-operated libraries in Sheffield, approximately 1 million visits to libraries a year and around 6,500 home visits a year. There had been an uplift in terms of e-books and children's borrowing over the last few years. At the start of the pandemic, the Council had invested £20,000 into its e-book service, which had resulted in an increase in around 2,000 people signing up as borrowers. She stated that associate libraries had seen a reduction in loans from the city catalogue, although they do have their own collections. Current national data did not include statistics regarding book loans from

volunteer-run libraries, and there was a need to ensure that such information was included in the data. Councillor Lea stated that funding for associate libraries currently stood at around £209,000, together with a one-off fund of £10,000 this year, for each library, including Council-run libraries, to be used for whatever they wanted it for, but in consultation with the local community. Associate libraries still had the book collection they had when they first started, and any underspend they had could be used to purchase books. Approximately £1.7 million savings had been made since the time of the libraries review. In terms of the comparisons with Leeds, Councillor Lea stated that that city had a population of around 800,000, and had 30 libraries, whereas Sheffield, with a population of around 650,000, had 28 libraries. Leeds sold off a number of their library buildings, in response to Government cuts, and invested in community hubs, which combine their library services with other Council services. Leeds' hub staff worked alongside other front-line Council staff undertaking other duties as well as library services-related duties. In addition, Leeds Central library was open for shorter working hours on Sundays, but closed during Christmas holidays. As regards the Carnegie library at Tinsley, Councillor Lea stated that this was last used as a library in 1985 and the library was then housed in a rented shop building which closed at the time of the library review. She commented that work has started on a new library in Tinsley which will be housed at the One Stop Shop/Tinsley Forum and would open as soon as the situation with the pandemic permits. She added that Walkley library was run by volunteers who have applied to the Heritage Lottery Fund to renovate the building.

5.3 Public Questions

The Chair (Councillor Julie Dore) invited two members of the public to ask questions which they had submitted prior to the published deadline for submission of questions. There had been additional questions received after the submission deadline from five members of the public. The questions received on the day of this meeting would be answered in writing after the meeting, and the Chair indicated she would read out the questions received the previous day as these related to the petition on libraries.

5.4 Public Questions Regarding Libraries (Read Out By The Chair)

5.4.1 Laura Swaffield's question stated that she very much applauded the efforts of volunteers to keep library buildings open. She questioned what research had the Council done to evaluate the performance of these volunteer centres as actual library services, given the huge drop in both visits and book issues at all of them, the very low reading attainment in certain catchment areas and the extra needs for supported internet access in others?

5.4.2 Shirley Burnham's question stated that some years ago she lived on Empire Road, as a single parent, with a little daughter who attended Sharrow Lane Primary School. She stated that it was tragic to her that a City that had one of the best library services in the country had decided to allow them to be 'DIY'd'. Now, after Covid-19, she respectfully asked the Cabinet whether there were any plans to revitalise those libraries and take them back under Council control. She

considered that they could be the means of rebuilding Sheffield communities and vital infrastructure; therefore could be very useful.

5.4.3 David Hayes' questions were what had been done to assess the viability of the proposed catering and office development at Walkley Carnegie Library given the current downturn in trade due to coronavirus and the extreme likelihood of an ensuing economic depression. He asked whether the Council was aware that the Charity Commission had written to the volunteer sites at the former Stannington and Broomhill Libraries to remind them of their responsibilities regarding safeguarding and recruitment of volunteers after it was revealed that their respective volunteer application forms allegedly either did not ask for references or state that these may not be taken up. What action will the Council be taking on this issue? He added that given that 61% of children in the Darnall Ward, which included Tinsley, were failing to meet the required standard of reading at Key Stage 2 - does the Council think that now is the right time to reinstate a professionally staffed library service from the former Carnegie Library building on Bawtry Road?

5.4.4 In response, Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure) stated that, to her knowledge, no formal academic work had been carried out with regard to the associate/volunteer-run libraries. She agreed that the volunteers were doing an excellent job and stated that a peer review had recently been carried out by the Local Government Association, which had included consultation with a number of partner organisations, including the associate libraries. The outcome of the review had indicated that the model used in Sheffield was of national significance. Councillor Lea stated that the low reading attainment in parts of the City was a very complex issue, and not just linked to the lack of library services, but included a number of other factors. Whilst libraries did play a key part in children's learning, the Service continued to arrange a number of educational events with schools, and she added that libraries can, and do, play a major part in digital inclusion. Councillor Lea stated that the Council had followed national guidelines with regard to Walkley Library and, in respect of Stannington Library, she was aware of the receipt of a letter from the Charity Commission, and confirmed that the Council did seek references for volunteers taken on to work in and around the Library.

5.5 Public Question Regarding The Understanding Of Covid-19 By People With A Disability

5.5.1 Adam Butcher questioned whether, in the light of different research reports and the Sheffield Covid-19 Plan, which was submitted to the Cabinet on the 20th May 2020, how was the Council making sure people with a disability could understand what was going on?

5.5.2 Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children and Families) responded that this was a very important, and complex, issue and she confirmed that people in Sheffield with a learning disability were supported in many different ways, with the nature of care depending on where they resided, such as in residential care, supported living or at home on their own. It had been very difficult for the Council to provide clear and consistent advice to people with a

disability on the basis that the advice from Government and Public Health England had been constantly changing. The Council continued to work closely with residential care homes, nursing homes and supported living schemes, together with other care providers to ensure that they were all having regular conversations with their residents in connection with current issues regarding Covid-19. All such conversations were held based on the capacity of the individuals. In addition, Care Trust staff and all Service staff and community teams were in contact with them. Councillor Drayton stated that it was clearly more difficult in terms of people living on their own and, in the light of this, the Council and Public Health England were providing advice. The Council was also working closely with its partners in connection with publicising this advice and guidance through Disability Direct, Citizens' Advice Bureaus, Mencap and other individual providers. In addition, the Council was in touch with people via its e-helpline, particularly those who were shielding, with regard to assistance with their shopping, obtaining medicines and social contact. Councillor Drayton stressed the need for people to receive sufficient support as they could feel isolated. In terms of safeguarding, Councillor Drayton stated that there was a telephone number for people to ring if they had any concerns. The Covid Bill granted the Council extra flexibility, but had not enacted any easements in Sheffield. In fact, Adult Social Care were providing more support to people. The Council was carrying out all its statutory duties under the Care Act, as well as being forced to deliver such services using new flexibility, creativity and technology, and in conjunction with its partners in health, housing, public health and care providers. Councillor Drayton concluded by encouraging people with any specific concerns to contact the Council, and officers would investigate their concerns.

5.6 Public Questions Regarding the Impact of Covid-19

5.6.1 Nigel Slack stated that given the current 20% contraction of the economy due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and the now seeming inevitability of a 'No Deal' Brexit, whilst locally Sheffield Hallam University were no longer expecting to develop the site opposite the Rail Station into a 30+ storey tower, some companies were recognising their ability to continue to do business without huge office spaces. There was no guarantee that we will ever return to the old normal from before the pandemic, and many argue that we should not try. With this in mind, would the Council continue to review their plans around the redevelopment of major new office and retail space? Perhaps steering away from a concentration of development in ever greater density and looking to increase the space available for people and wellbeing within the City Centre, including outdoor spaces, and creating for what may need to be the new normal for our City?

5.6.2 Mr Slack asked whether the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development could comment on plans for extending the pedestrianisation of the City Centre, particularly with a view to timescales and any planned consultation with the public and businesses?

5.6.3 Mr Slack stated that whilst we were all cognisant of the stresses the Council was under during these difficult times, it is important that democracy and, from his point of view, public scrutiny, continued to be seen to be done. The webcasting

and the remote inclusion of public questions was a welcome part of this, but he queried what the Council's expectations were about responding to outstanding issues from prior to the pandemic? For himself, there were outstanding responses concerning the Hanover Tower report, the ongoing saga of the disposal of Mount Pleasant and issues under the Portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change.

- 5.6.4 Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Business and Investment) stated that how cities moved forward after the Covid-19 pandemic represented a global challenge. The Council had, and would continue, to ensure that there were public spaces for people to meet in the City, not just in the City Centre. The pandemic would obviously have a long-term impact on the City, and both the public and private sector were currently looking at how to progress their respective development schemes. Councillor Iqbal referred specifically to the Heart of the City II scheme, referring to how the Council, working closely with its development partner, was looking at each individual element of the scheme, looking at all the various factors and progressing each one with due diligence. He stated that he could not provide any firm details as to how the scheme would progress, but did state that, based on the information available at the present time, the Council would be progressing with the Radisson Blu hotel development as part of the scheme.
- 5.6.5 Councillor Bob Johnson (Cabinet Member for Transport and Development) reported that the schedule for the pedestrianisation works in the City Centre, to allow for social distancing in preparation for the re-opening of the City Centre, had been brought forward under the Covid legislation. Due to the timescales, the works had been undertaken without prior public consultation, although he was happy to receive any comments from anyone, either directly or via their local Ward Councillors, and adjustments would be considered. Councillor Johnson confirmed that all the works were temporary for the time being, and if any were to be proposed to remain permanent, this would require a formal consultation process.
- 5.6.6 The Chair (Councillor Julie Dore) reported that, in response to the Government's recent announcement on support for construction projects, the Sheffield City Region had commenced discussions on identifying "shovel-ready" projects which could be promoted, and projects relating to outdoor activity and public spaces were being considered. She stated that most of the main Council Committees were back in operation, albeit virtually, with the Planning and Highways, and Licensing Committees having held meetings, the Cabinet having already met, and discussions were being held in terms of holding full Council meetings. Fortnightly Member briefings on the pandemic were being held with officers and, on the alternate weeks, the Members of Parliament were having similar briefings. In addition, local community response teams were meeting weekly, involving community groups and organisations. Members of the public could keep updated on Council news and activities via the Newsroom or via Twitter and Facebook. Councillor Dore stated that everyone was trying the best they could, in difficult circumstances, and would try and get back to normal as soon as it was possible and safe to do so.

- 5.6.7 Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance) reported that the final legal contracts in respect of Mount Pleasant were to be exchanged very shortly, and that this would provide an opportunity for Shipshape to have a lease on their current building, to enable the site to then be handed over to the developer.
- 5.6.8 Councillor Paul Wood (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety) reported that although the Council had committed to holding a public meeting with the residents of Hanover Tower Block, this had not been possible due to Covid, and with Zoom not being practical for such a meeting, Members and officers had consulted with the Tenants' and Residents' Association to establish all the different languages required for the translation of the information to enable the report to be issued within the next few weeks. The residents would be given the choice as to whether the report be published, and residents offered the chance to feedback any concerns to the Council, or to wait and hold a public meeting, albeit sometime in the future.
- 5.6.9 Councillor Mark Jones (Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change) stated that he would arrange a Zoom meeting for himself, Mr Slack and relevant officers, to look at protocols regarding Amey and stress-testing.

6. RETIREMENT OF STAFF

- 6.1 The Executive Director, Resources, 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>
<u>People Portfolio</u>		
Marie Biggs	Teaching Assistant Level 2, Lydgate Junior School	23
Janet Cann	Team Manager, Adult Services	30
Helen Davies	Teacher, Phillimore Community Primary School	37
Alison Hall	Senior Hub Practitioner, Children and Families	34
John Kennedy	Senior Fieldwork Manager, Children's Services	44

Alison Murray	Teacher, Shooters Grove Primary School	20
Jill Scott	Senior Business Support Officer	43
Anne Wilson	Teacher - Hearing Impaired	26
Vivienne Wright	Contracts Officer, Commissioning	33

Place Portfolio

Anthony Andrews	Senior Engineer	40
Stuart Barratt	Senior Private Rented Standards Officer	37
Christopher Dorries	Coroner	28
Christopher Galloway	Principal Engineer	43
Jean Houghton	Senior Civil Enforcement Officer	38
Michael Pruzinsky	Environmental Services Officer	20
Garry Seargeant	Glazier	40
Wendy Woodhead	Operational Processes Manager	40

Resources Portfolio

Joanne Bellamy	Business Support Officer	35
Andrea Benson	Finance Officer	40
Maria Day	Finance Officer	38
Rebecca Drennan	Digital Content Production Officer	30
Susan Gears	Assistant Professional Officer	39
Anthony Greenwood	Finance Manager	30
Karen Haigh	Finance Officer	42
Paul Hale	Finance Support Officer	40
Margaret Radford	Payroll Administrator	49
Howard Rogerson	Claims Officer	39
Gerald Turner	Senior Category Manager	37

- (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. DATE OF THE CABINET MEETING IN FEBRUARY 2021

- 7.1 RESOLVED: That the meeting of the Cabinet in February 2021 be held at 2.00 pm on Wednesday 17th February, not on 24th February as previously agreed.

8. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY

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

9. SCRUTINY OF THE DECISION ON MONTH 11 CAPITAL APPROVALS 2019/20 - HEART OF THE CITY II - BLOCK A, PALATINE CHAMBERS

- 9.1 The Cabinet received a report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee outlining the outcome of the Committee's consideration, at its meeting held on 4th June 2020, of the decision taken by the Leader of the Council on 16 April 2020 in relation to the Heart of the City Phase II – Block A (Palatine Chambers) which was one of the schemes approved within the Month 11 Capital Approvals 2019/20.

- 9.2 Councillor Mick Rooney (Chair of the Scrutiny Committee) reported that the basis for the decision centred mainly on the Covid-19 pandemic, in terms of whether or not progress should be made on this particular element of the Heart of the City II scheme, given the uncertainty and economic effects of the pandemic. He stated that the meeting comprised a very lengthy question and answer session and he expressed his thanks to Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Business and Investment) and Nalin Seneviratne (Director of City Centre Development) for attending the meeting and reporting on the current position, and responding to the questions raised. Councillor Rooney stated that due diligence checks were being taken at every stage of the development process, which included a series of checks and balances to test out the market on a regular basis. He stressed that the scheme was not due to commence for a further two years, and that hopefully, there may have been some uplift in the economy at that time. Radisson Blu (the hotel chain) were still very much committed to the development. He reported that independent advice had also been sought, which had indicated that it would be a prudent move. Councillor Rooney concluded by reporting that the decision of the Scrutiny Committee was to take no further action in respect of the decision, and that regular updates be provided to the Committee as and when appropriate, with regard to progress of the scheme.

- 9.3 RESOLVED: That Cabinet notes the recommendation made by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee as now reported.

10. SCRUTINY OF THE DECISION ON INVESTMENT IN YOUNG PEOPLE

- 10.1 The Cabinet received a report of the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee outlining the outcome of the Committee's consideration, at its meeting held on 21st May 2020, of the decision taken by the Cabinet on 18 March 2020 regarding Investment in Young People.
- 10.2 Councillor Mick Rooney (Chair of the Scrutiny Committee) reported that a considerable number of questions were raised at the meeting, with the answers to several of such questions included in the paper which was due to be considered by the Cabinet in April, but the Cabinet meeting had been cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Councillor Rooney believed that if this meeting had gone ahead, the item may not have been called-in.
- 10.3 The Chair (Councillor Julie Dore) referred to the report that was due to be submitted to the Cabinet in April indicating that the call-in of the item had stalled the progress of the Cabinet decision on this issue in March. Councillor Dore expressed her thanks to Councillor Rooney for chairing what had been a very difficult meeting, particularly as it was one of the first meetings held via Zoom.
- 10.4 RESOLVED: That the Cabinet:-
- (a) notes the decision of the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee to request that the decision be deferred until the Scrutiny Committee has considered all relevant issues and made recommendations to the Executive;
 - (b) agrees to the request from the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee to defer the decision, as above; and
 - (c) irrespective of recommendation (b) above, the Cabinet agrees to provide more detail to the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on what is envisaged in the service going forward, as identified in item 2.4 of the report, preferably at an early point in the timeline, prior to the Executive Decision.

11. THE FUTURE DELIVERY OF YOUTH SERVICES

- 11.1 The Executive Director, People Services, submitted a report outlining the recommended next steps for delivery of youth services beyond September 2020.
- 11.2 Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children and Families) stated that she hoped the report would address all the concerns and questions raised at the meeting of the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 21st May 2020, and that the report was very clear in terms of its proposals.
- 11.3 Further to a query raised by Councillor Drayton with regard to the timescales, the Executive Director, People Services (John Macilwraith) stated that the primary

objective would be to ensure that young people were fully supported through the transfer, and a team of officers had been recruited to commence work to identify how the transition would be managed. Mr Macilwraith accepted that the transfer of the service, and the consultation, would represent a challenge for the Authority, but that everyone involved would do their utmost to work with the trade unions and those members of staff affected to ensure that the transition took place within the agreed timeframe. He stated that any issues arising from the consultation and discussions with the trade unions would be referred to the Cabinet as soon as they were identified. Mr Macilwraith concluded by stating that the current option to transfer the service in-house had always been part of the offer, as part of the review initiated by the Leader some 18-24 months ago, and details of which would have been communicated to Sheffield Futures.

11.4 RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the appraisal of delivery options and approves the future delivery model for youth services, as set out in the report;
- (b) approves the establishment of a cross-portfolio Project Board and Project Group to manage the end of the current contract and transfer relevant staff and services to the Council;
- (c) to the extent not covered by existing delegations, delegates authority to the Executive Director of People Services to make the appropriate arrangements to bring the relevant services in-house on 1st October 2020; and
- (d) notes that this decision will be subject to the Leader taking into consideration any recommendations from the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

11.5 Reasons for Decision

The approach set out in the report will provide a more coordinated set of provision and support for the young people of Sheffield and enable them to fulfil their potential. Taking back the direct management and delivery of a range of youth services will enable the Council to take a flexible and integrated approach in future provision for young people. A wider strategic citywide approach will enable the Council to engage with a range of other partners, including the NHS, police, schools, communities and the voluntary sector, to coordinate resources and approaches across the city, and enable us to deliver our ambitions and aspirations for young people in Sheffield.

11.6 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 11.6.1 Since 2015 a number of exercises have been undertaken by Council officers to consider the potential future delivery options for youth services, in preparation for the end of the long term contract with Sheffield Futures. In 2015, for example, work investigating the potential to develop a youth mutual type organisation was undertaken with support from the Cabinet Office through its Delivering Differently

for Young People programme. Alternative approaches to the proposal set out in the recommendations in the report are outlined below.

11.6.2 Alternative Option 1 – Retender the current services contracted to Sheffield Futures

- Delivery partnerships with charities or other independent organisations can provide opportunity to secure other resources (for example from charitable sources) to add value to the funding from Council contracts. These opportunities will not be as available to Council-run services. However, there are also a number of disadvantages of this option.
- There exist a number of organisations nationally who might be in a position to bid to deliver our youth services. However, there is a risk that the market might not be able to deliver services at a competitive price that meets the Council's stringent pay and output requirements.
- Some of the complexities of the TUPE and in particular pension costs of the existing staff are likely to be a barrier to new providers having an interest in the contract. This might limit realistic bids and reduce competition or innovation.
- External contracts do not always provide sufficient flexibility in delivery and resources to respond to emerging and changing needs and requirements. This is a particular concern given that the intention is to develop more integrated and more flexible services that can adapt quickly.
- If Sheffield Futures were not successful in securing this retendered contract then this would mean introducing a new provider to our local landscape of youth services as set out in the report. This would create a more complex picture of services in contradiction of our ambition to integrate and simplify service provision for young people.

On balance we believe the positive benefits of this option are outweighed by the disadvantages compared to the preferred option of taking core services in-house.

11.6.3 Option 2 – Integrate and outsource a wider range of youth support services through an external commission

- By expanding the number of additional functions included in an external contracted service, there are potential advantages through integration, and ability to attract alternative external resources through new funding models like social investment/impact bonds.
- However, having explored a number of possible options, we have concluded that social investment models can be very complex, and are costly to commission and monitor. The outcomes for young people we are seeking to achieve are often long term and influenced by a wide range of factors out of the control of the services we directly deliver. This makes them unsuitable for a narrowly defined 'payment by results' approach overall, although this might be suitable for some individual defined projects.
- Integrating externally would involve outsourcing a number of other existing Council-run services, including youth justice, care leaver support etc. Our conclusion is that these services would be unsuitable for outsourced delivery as they are high risk and part of the Council's core delivery of children's social care services.

- An external model reduces the Council direct control and influence, and flexibility of service delivery and resources.

11.6.4 Option 3 - Seek to create a new Sheffield Youth Mutual Organisation

- A number of local authority areas have, in the last 10 years, moved to create new independent youth mutual organisations, effectively 'spinning out' their existing youth services into a new employee-led charitable organisation.
- However, this option is not available to the Council, because our Youth Services are already delivered through a contract with an independent charity, and the staff are not employed by the Council.

11.6.5 Option 4 - Create an alternative type of new organisation (for example a Sheffield 'Youth Trust').

- Under this option, a new organisation could be established, if possible in partnership with other organisations, in order to pool resources and funding.
- The new organisation could take just a commissioning role (acting on behalf of all statutory organisations, for example, and contracting services on their behalf) OR directly employ staff and direct delivery.
- This approach has some potential advantages in terms of collaboration and aligning of resources. However, it would involve establishing a number of complex legal and organisational structures, including financial and contractual arrangements that would involve considerable costs to set up and maintain. There was concern when looking at this option that funds better used for frontline youth services would be used in managing the organisational arrangements and potential sub-contracting arrangements.
- One option in this category that was investigated was creating what is called a 'teckal' organisation – this is a company operating at arm's length from a council, but which is owned and directed by the Council. This model has potential advantages in that it can be more directly controlled and resources can be shared without competitive tender processes. However, a teckal company has limited scope to trade externally and draw in other resources, meaning ultimately it has been rejected as no more advantageous than the Council directly running the services and employing the staff itself.

11.6.6 Option 5 - Stop or significantly reduce youth services

- This is not considered a viable option because the Council is committed to positive outcomes for young people and to community based youth work and support.
- A number of statutory duties still exist which we need to continue to deliver.

12. MONTH 1 CAPITAL APPROVALS 2020-21

- 12.1 The Executive Director, Resources, submitted a report providing details of proposed changes to the Capital Programme 2020/21, as brought forward in Month 1.

12.2 RESOLVED: That Cabinet 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 contract.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

The proposed changes to the Capital Programme will improve the services to the people of Sheffield.

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.

To obtain the relevant delegations to allow projects to proceed.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

13.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Cabinet would be held on Wednesday, 15th July 2020, at 2.00 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank