

Appendix A

Public Petitions and Questions –Charity Trustees Sub- Committee– 21st March 2023

N.B - Please note that a period of up to 30 minutes shall be allocated at meetings of Policy Committees and other appropriate bodies for members of the public to present ordinary petitions or to ask questions of Members and officers present.

Petitions Received from Members of the Public - 0

	Petitions	Response:
1.	n/a	

Questions Received from Members of the Public x 5

1.	Question from Friends of Hillsborough Park	Response:
	1. Is the Committee comfortable in approving a scheme which will reduce access to the current free-to-use MUGA which is currently well used by Cycling4All and the casual users who play on it throughout the year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes to the MUGA area are not about losing free space, but about reconfiguration of the space to enable a wider range of people and groups to engage in sport and recreational activity. A dedicated MUGA space that meets Sport England design guidance is being proposed, and additional to this will be informal space that enables a range of concurrent activities including basketball 3x3 and table tennis. • To make a park a welcoming and active space for all ages and abilities, we know from previous evidence such as Sport England’s 10 Principles of Active Design and the University of Sheffield’s IWUN (Improving Wellbeing through Urban Nature) project that a number of key ingredients are required. These include refreshments/toilets, a range of sport and recreational facilities that attract a wide range of users, a good quality green space and a range of community and sports groups (or to coin a Sheffield phrase ‘a Brew, Loo and Something to Do) • The focus of the capital investment within the Activity Hub proposal will be in the provision of recreational facilities that encourage people and groups to do repeat visits – in order to increase their physical activity levels and improve their health and wellbeing. Quality welfare facilities are required to enable duration of visits to be extended and investment in park infrastructure is needed to accommodate an increase in user numbers. • Cycling for All (C4A) are an important delivery partner within Hillsborough Park (as well as their reach across the city and region), we have been in discussions throughout about how their users

		<p>can be accommodated within the space. Accommodation of their needs within the new footprint, was included within the procurement specification as a mandatory requirement – see response to C4A question below for detailed response to this</p>
	<p>2. Given the issues highlighted in the FoHP briefing does this Committee believe Hillsborough Park would be the optimal location for an Activity Hub</p>	<p>As outlined within the Co-Op Exec Report April 2022, Hillsborough Park was identified as suitable for a number of reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The park already has a sports area, and this sports area is need of reinvestment due to the deteriorating conditions of the existing tennis and MUGA provision • The provision of an exciting and high-quality facility of this nature will raise the standard of the park and increase its attractiveness as a destination supporting Green Flag aspirations • The location provides a mixed demographic and potential reach to an important audience of people we should be working harder to engage including those on lower incomes • Currently, provision for this type of activity is lacking in the north of Sheffield. Not only would this be a unique project for the whole of the City but it would also be addressing a need for this area • The park is a city destination site with good transportation and access links • There are a range of complimentary developments that are currently progressing including the Coach House, the All-Wheels Track, improvements to the pathway, Library developments and the playground improvements. • As with the current tennis courts, some facilities would be paid-for use such as the Padel Tennis <p>The Parks and Countryside Service continues to find opportunities to develop in sites across Sheffield, for sites without toilets we are considering how we best do this. Part of the benefits of this proposal will mean that sites such as Concord and High Hazels Parks will continue to receive investment to their facilities, with free provision provided to people who we should be working harder to engage.</p>
	<p>3. Is there evidence that there will be an increase in physical activity or is there the likelihood that a smaller MUGA and more pay-to-use space will lead to less activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current MUGA and tennis court facility is not considered to be in good condition. This area of the park, with the exception of the new pump track, is looking tired and is need of renewal in order to improve and sustain good quality sports and recreation facilities for people of all ages and abilities. The MUGA area does not currently meet Sport England guidelines for such facilities and is not conducive to the playing of competitive games – both of 5-side football or basketball. We know from experience and research that improvements to the quality of spaces will increase attendance and therefore physical activity levels to a wider range of people • The current facilities provide access for certain groups who are able to play informally within the space. The introduction of an increased informal and formal offer of activities with a range of managed spaces will enable more audiences to access physical activity opportunities. There is a

		<p>wealth of emerging evidence through Sport England and more locally the National Centre for Sport and Exercise Medicines (Move More physical activity Plan) that sport alone is not a hook for everyone to be active. There are many barriers to being physical activity and the quality of facilities, access to toilet/welfare facilities as well as cost and knowledge of services are significant – this project seeks to address and minimize those barriers so more target groups can be active. The recent Sport and Leisure strategy consultation highlighted the need for more high-quality doorstep community facilities and improved recreational facilities in green spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making Space for Girls – FoHP have highlighted the point regarding fencing which does need to be carefully considered within the designs (and is a key consideration) however to provide a balanced perspective, the other key elements from this research show the importance of; lighting, site presence and toilets as well as the creation of smaller spaces which avoid male groups dominating, which the multi-activity activity hub would provide. • The consultation undertaken early in 2022 on the specific proposal included a question regarding how the introduction of an activity hub would impact on park users’ usage of Hillsborough Park and over half of respondents (52.72%) said they would use the park more than they currently do
	<p>4. Does the Committee have access to and have confidence in the financial viability of the scheme. (Is there more scrutiny of projects after the experience of the Fargate container scheme?)</p>	<p>Financial due diligence has been carried out (See Financial Summary within March 23 Committee Report) which highlights the business model and viability of this proposal at Hillsborough Park.</p> <p>A number of financial questions have been asked by the FoHP in their report to Cllr Bryan Lodge, but please note that financial information is included in a closed appendix as it is considered commercially sensitive.</p>
	<p>5. Is the Committee content that a procurement process for a major development is based on the proposal from a current supplier</p>	<p>The decisions taken within Co-Operative Executive in April 2022 set out that this proposal was developed in partnership with a range of national partners including the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA), the current operator and Sport England. It is part of the wider parks tennis strategy the LTA are working towards nationally.</p> <p>We considered a range of options to progress this idea, as the existing operator was 5 years into a 10-year agreement. We asked the question whether this could be developed as part of their existing arrangement. However the nature and scale of the proposal means that an open and transparent procurement route was the appropriate mechanism for this. Following approval from Co-Operative Executive in April 2022 officers have progressed this.</p>
	<p>6. Is the Committee satisfied that The Report to the Cooperative Executive Committee was an</p>	<p>Members past and present, including those Members who took the decision to proceed with the procurement of this hub model were briefed throughout the development of the proposal. A project</p>

	accurate description of the situation and that it gave an opportunity for adequate scrutiny	team have worked on this including finance, legal and procurement colleagues ensuring the process is followed properly and that financial scrutiny and due diligence has been carried out throughout. The report and associated documentation were scrutinised and understood by the Executive before taking the decision.
	7. Is the Committee satisfied that the consultation with the public in April 2022 and the conclusions drawn from the 20921 Hillsborough Forward plan and the 2018 Better Parks consultation	<p>Consultation has formed a key part of the proposal, and this has been happening in various stages for the last 2 years.</p> <p>The forward plan consultation informed the need for improvements to the recreational facilities in the park. At this stage the consultation didn't go into the detail around specifics for this proposal as that wasn't what it was designed to do, and the proposal was not as developed at this point. At the point that a decision was requested from Co-Operative Executive, conversation with the FoHP identified a request for more specific consultation. FoHP recognised that their view was not necessarily representative of families and wider audiences and that they would prefer to see a consultation carried out before the procurement started seeking public opinion on the proposal.</p> <p>This consultation was carried out with 607 responses. In response to the question 'Do you support the proposal of the Hillsborough Activity Hub project?', 67.87% said yes and 16.64% said no. In response to the question 'Do you think you would make use of the Hillsborough Activity Hub?', 58.15% said yes and 18.29% said no. And in response to the question 'How would an Activity Hub like this impact on your usage of Hillsborough Park?', 52.72% said they would use the park more than they currently do, 27.02% said they would use the park the same amount as they currently do and 9.72% said they would use the park less than they currently do.</p>
	8. Is the Committee therefore confident that it can award a contract and any associated disposal of land which may be necessary, and any consents or approvals required.	Yes. Due diligence has been undertaken on this project.
2.	Questions from Friends of Hillsborough Park	Response:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the £420,000 of capital expenditure on paths in Hillsborough Park not included in the accounts? 	<p>The capital expenditure on Hillsborough Paths totalled £436,131. Of this, £1,675 was incurred in 21/22 and is included in the restricted balance of £69,807 in the Statement of financial activities – Income and Endowments from Donations and legacies.</p> <p>The remaining £434,456 spend was incurred in 2022/23 and will therefore appear in next year's accounts.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is £33,500 the total Tramlines fee and if not why does it not show in the Charitable accounts? 	<p>The amount of £33,500 is the 2021/22 site fee (rent), for the tramlines event. The income remains with the charity site to fund additional improvement work on footpaths and drainage.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On what basis are some costs and expenses excluded from the charitable accounts and is this acceptable practice for a registered charity? 	<p>The accounts have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Statement of Recommended Practice, 'Accounting and Reporting by Charities' which provides that the statement of financial activities should include all income, gains, expenditure and losses recognised for the reporting period (2021/22).</p>
3.	<p>Question from Sheffield Cycling 4 all</p>	
	<p><u>Question 1</u> Sheffield Cycling 4 All would like to register our concern that the provider has not put forward a workable solution which will enable us to continue to offer our current level of activities and services. We are one of the UK's leading inclusive cycling hubs and the only one in the Sheffield region. We have been operating from the park for over 14 years and welcome 100 people every week to our cycling sessions for disabled people and people with long term health conditions. Is the Committee comfortable with approving a contract which will negatively impact the level and quality of service we are able to offer – as well as put us in conflict with other casual users of the MUGA due to its much-reduced size?</p>	<p>Cycling for All (C4A) are an important delivery partner within Hillsborough Park (as well as their reach across the city and region), we have been in discussions throughout about how their users can be accommodated within the space. Accommodation of their needs within the new footprint, was included within the procurement specification as a mandatory requirement. Ideas discussed to date include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hillsborough multi-activity hub to be as accessible a destination as possible, for everyone including those living with disability; this could include gate entry points, removable equipment and toilet design, C4A input into the design would be welcomed • Signage and information online to support with awareness of when C4A are on site within the MUGA area • Recognition that for the holiday periods as the key potential pinch points that options ought to be considered, including use for different groups within other spaces within the hub space and wider park including the neighbouring Pump Track, free holiday activities taking place within the tennis courts • To reduce potential user conflicts when in use by Cycling for All, that alternative options are provided for basketball 'hoop shooting' – in areas such as the courtyard space • The nearby grass areas also provide further kickabout options with portable football goals available for free loan from the hub • Portable netball posts to be included within the tennis court area • Activity design features such as low level basketball hoops are also being proposed • A booking option (still to remain free but to manage space) to be explored to see how this could work, together with C4A • Refreshments available to users and volunteers with concessionary and discount options to be considered • In addition the Parks and Countryside service are keen following discussions with Disability Sheffield and Cycling for All to explore options for C4A to have satellite based at other park venues across Sheffield

		<p>It's important that the space enables as many groups as possible to work alongside each other coherently, research shows that the zoning off and creation of different activity spaces will enable this more, but clearly it's a change which needs to be thought through and then managed in a fluid way. We don't think we have all the answers and would seek to work with C4A as well as others to work this through, whilst regularly reviewing and tweaking as required.</p>
	<p><u>Question 2</u> The report submitted to the Charity trustee Sub-Committee currently states that the provider must: “Ensure the activity hub enables the services and operations offered by Cycling for All, which currently provides their main service offer from the existing multi-use games area space.” Will the Committee seek assurance that it is written into the contract that the provider is required to enable our <i>current</i> level of services and operations?</p>	<p>The requirement that the provider ‘ensure the activity hub enables the services and operations offered by Cycling for All, which currently provides their main service offer from the existing multi-use games area space’ was written into the procurement requirements and specification. It is an expectation of the Council that this form a part of the contract.</p>
4	<p>Question from Andy Kershaw</p>	
	<p>I was more than astonished to find no mention of the Rose Garden café in the latest set of accounts http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/documents/58386/Graves%20Park%20Accounts%202022%20-%20Draft%202.pdf submitted for Graves Park by SCC as sole corporate trustee of the park and to that end I'd like to table the following questions for the meeting next week.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why is there no mention in either financial activity (income or expenditure) or actual work (maintenance or repairs) to the Rose Garden Cafe building in the latest set of accounts submitted to the Charity Commission by SCC as sole corporate trustee of Graves Park 	<p>The Café is run by a third party operator. Only income from rent is included in the accounts shown on p247 of the agenda pack. The cost of running the park is funded by Sheffield City Council. Annual revenue expenditure is generally greater than income and any variance is borne by the Council by way of a grant to the charity. The period covered by the accounts is 1/04/2021 – 31/03/2022. The building was closed in July 2022 so outside of the accounting period. There is however a post balance sheet event note on p251 to acknowledge the situation and net book value of the café building.</p> <p>Income from the RGC is shown in the accounts. It is included in charitable activities. Expenditure on maintenance is not included in the report as to date this has been funded through the Facilities Management budget (as with the majority of buildings managed within Parks).</p>

	<p>2. The Council appears to regard the building as 'invisible' in these accounts and it's duties and responsibilities to and for the building are omitted from any reference in the report</p> <p>3. Given 1 & 2 above, does the council accept that the Graves Park accounts and the Report of the Trustee are misleading and erroneous in this regard?</p> <p>4. Given that this is a 100 year old building should a reference to the Council's role as trustee in relation to the Rose Garden Cafe be included in the accounts since the Animal Farm and other buildings is mentioned?</p> <p>5. Will the accounts and the annual report of SCC as sole corporate trustee of Graves park now be amended to include it's duties and responsibilities to and for this building be included in the accounts and it's annual trustees report?</p>	
5.	Question from Andy Kershaw	
	<p>1. What is the sources of the items (p247 public agenda pack) entitled Rents 153,068 109,377</p>	<p>Income from rents shown in the Graves Park Accounts is from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ice Cream Partnership - Rose Garden Café - Sheffield Inclusion Centre - Rides - Events (Fair ground and race for life) - Service Tenancies - The Old School House. <p>The increase in income from 20/21 to 21/22 was largely due to rides and events after activities resumed post Covid.</p>