

Gleadless Valley

A great place to live and grow



Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board: Meeting Minutes

Date: 16 January 2025

Time: 18:00 – 19:30

Location: Holy Cross Church, Spotswood Place S14 1LG

Interim Chair: Kate Martin, Executive Director, City Futures, Sheffield City Council

Board Members Present:

Kate Martin Executive Director, City Futures, Sheffield City Council	KM	Ajman Ali Executive Director, Operational Services, Sheffield City Council	AA
John (Jock) Stevenson Gleadless Valley Foodbank	JS	Cllr Tom Hunt Labour, Leader of Sheffield City Council	TH
Rev David Middleton Holy Cross Church	DM	Cllr Douglas Johnson Green Party, Chair of the Housing & Policy Committee	DJ
Max Richardson Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	MR	Cllr Marianne Elliot Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	ME
Lara Joyce Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association <i>Online via MS Teams</i>	LJ	Cllr Paul Turpin Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	PT
Matt Lawton Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	ML		

Council Officers Present:

Matthew Nimmo Interim Regeneration & Housing Growth Advisor, SCC	MN	Sean McClean Director of Regeneration & Development, SCC	SM
Daniel Parry-King Service Manager, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	DPK	Dave Luck Head of Local Area Committee, SCC	DL



Quintina Crozier Operations & Development Manager, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	QC	Ian Foster (taking minutes) Project Support Officer, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	IF
Carl Mullooly Local Area Committees Head of Service, SCC	CM	John Powell Partnership Manager for Employment, Skills & Economy, SCC	JP
Ruth Bell Head of Parks & Countryside, SCC	RB	Laura Hayfield Head of Employment, Skills and Economy, SCC	LH
Dean Butterworth Head of Housing Investment & Maintenance, SCC	DB		

Guest present: Alexis Krachai

Agenda Items & Minutes:

1. Round table introductions (KM)

- 1.1 KM welcomed the Board to the meeting. A round of introductions was conducted with those present in the room and those joining via Microsoft Teams.
- 1.2 Apologies were noted from May Connolly and Andy Jackson from Heeley City Trust. No conflicts of interest were noted.

2. Minutes & matters arising (KM)

Minutes from previous meeting (included within papers)

- 2.1 The minutes were taken to be an accurate reflection of the meeting held on 30th October 2024.
- 2.2 It was agreed that the minutes would be reviewed in respect of confidentiality before they are shared with the public. **See action 1.**
- 2.3 In response to concerns raised by DM, it was confirmed that the term masterplan does not refer to current work or future work. The 'Masterplan' refers to the document which was published in 2023, but SCC and partners are now working together to deliver the 'Gleadless Valley Regeneration Programme' per MN.
- 2.4 Regarding the letters sent to residents in blocks due to be demolished or remodelled, PT asked whether there has been follow-up communication with residents and what feedback was received. ML responded that the TARA did not receive many enquiries from residents as a result of the mailing but have received a lot of negative feedback concerning the Savills Stock Condition Surveys work. DM cautioned against interpreting lack of responses as apathy. ME stated that the letter could have been shorter, clearer and focused more heavily on how to log required repairs.
- 2.5 DM and JS referenced a loss of trust in the council. JS stated that residents 'don't believe a word being said' and that the current approach is 'not solving anything and is instead seen as wasting money rather than getting anything done'. KM noted the sentiment and referenced the previous in-depth discussion around lack of trust at the last Board meeting.
- 2.6 JS stated that SCC should 'make the first move' to stimulate engagement while also demonstrating that small things are being completed. DM advocated for face-to-face meetings between SCC and residents, with a view to asking three questions: 'what's good about where you live, what are the challenges, and what would you like to see change?'. Personal involvement is how trust begins per DM. **See action 4.**
- 2.7 PT said that SCC needs to restore the trust of the three GV ward councillors towards the regeneration programme. PT explained that the ward councillors are 'sidelined and ignored' despite knowing the estate



very well and being the 'conduit between the people and the council'. PT requested that SCC 'starts doing what the councillors are asking for'.

- 2.8 Concerns were raised by ML and DJ regarding the Stock Condition Surveys being completed by Savills. It was agreed that this would be covered during DB's Refurbishment & Sustainability workstream update.
- 2.9 MN referenced the updated Scheme of Governance which was circulated with the Board papers. The Board provided their approval of the revised Scheme, but it was highlighted that May Connolly's membership of the Board should be reviewed considering her departure from Heeley Trust. **See action 5.**
- 2.10 PT asked about the remuneration in place for individuals and organisations who are contributing their time to the development and delivery of the regeneration programme. He enquired as to the value of the contribution. MN indicated that the policy has been drafted and will shortly be shared with the Board. £75 will be issued to organisations per meeting for organisations, while individuals will be issued with a £25 voucher by Heeley Trust. **See action 6.**

3. Appointment of Independent Chair – Dan Parry-King

- 3.1 DPK provided a brief verbal summary of the 'consideration of recommendation' report which was circulated in advance of the meeting. KM expressed thanks to the Board members involved in the recruitment process.
- 3.2 PT asked about the 'two-way review' mechanism. DPK explained that this review mechanism applies to similar roles in the city and explained that AK will not be contractually obligated in any case, but that the review date provides a formal point for both sides to take stock and agree whether the chair should continue in role. DM asked whether decisions regarding the two-way review will ultimately be a Board decision; DPK responded that this requires further consideration. **See action 7.**
- 3.3 KM confirmed that walkarounds and a thorough induction schedule will be arranged for the chair, alongside the provision of all relevant papers.
- 3.4 TH commended the recruitment panel's recommendation to appoint AK and complimented AK's skillset.
- 3.5 The Board approved the appointment of AK as the Independent Chair of the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board.

4. Update from each workstream

Planning & Development – Matthew Nimmo

- 4.1 MN provided a verbal summary of the workstream update circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 4.2 In response to a question from JS regarding the potential locations for a supermarket, MN indicated that Newfield Green, the old school site at Hemsworth (formerly earmarked for an Older Persons Independent Living scheme) and land near Herdings are all potential options. JS responded that Newfield Green already has enough shops and questioned why other options in GV are being 'missed out'. In response, it was clarified that the Hemsworth site falls within Gleadless Valley and JS agreed that it would make a good location for a supermarket. DM asked whether local people will be able to afford 'good quality shops'. AD referenced the challenging hills in GV the lack of car ownership; as such, the location and plans should be aligned to SCC's public transport and active travel ambitions.
- 4.3 PT advised against stating that the masterplan has not been delivered due to money; there are other factors involved as well, such as SCC 'letting it down'.
- 4.4 The Board discussed the former plans to build an Older Persons Independent Living (OPIL) development at the former Hemsworth school site. PT stated that the site had planning permission, a developer was procured and then the project was ceased. PT questioned how and why the decision to cease delivery of the OPIL was made and indicated that the decision should not have been made by SCC officers without involvement of



Councillors. KM requested that the Board are provided with clarity about how the OPIL decision was made and the grounds for the decision. **See action 8.**

- 4.5 DM asked about the intentions to relocate residents in properties due to be demolished and what plans have been made for compensation. He highlighted the need for a fair and robust policy which that is in residents' best interests, and raised potential issues regarding taxation on compensation (homeloss) payments and the potential effects on eligibility for benefits. AA responded that once any blocks have been identified for demolition, a decant and local lettings policy will be produced which will address these concerns, and this will be brought forward to the board for approval.
- 4.6 AD questioned where residents will be moved to and highlighted the desire to ensure that people are given the opportunity to stay in the Gleadless Valley. DJ added that for regeneration to succeed, there must be new housing available for displaced residents to move into. This will help avoid fragmentation and damage caused to communities and help to avoid a knock-on impact on an already stretched priority system. DM highlighted the importance of residents being able to maintain their local support networks.
- 4.7 AD referenced the regeneration programmes' strapline of GV being a 'great place to live and grow', however the plans at present lack reference to children, young people and play opportunities.

Refurbishment & Sustainability – Dean Butterworth

- 4.8 DB provided a verbal summary of the workstream update circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 4.9 DB referenced £36m being available to spend on existing stock in Gleadless Valley, which equates to £16,000 per property, while deep-retrofit for a property costs £36,000 per property.
- 4.10 DB highlighted the ongoing work being completed by Savills in respect of Stock Condition Surveys. There are c. 2,000 surveys to complete in GV. The surveys are essential as they will help identify stock investment needs and areas of priority. DB indicated that the contracted work started quicker than expected so communications were not initially aligned with the contractors being present within GV.
- 4.11 ML outlined his disappointment regarding how the surveys are being conducted. He referenced the alarm and concerns caused by contractors knocking on doors without adequate notice and the consideration of people with vulnerabilities and additional needs. He gave examples of specific anxieties expressed by residents, the need to spend a large portion of time allaying their fears, and the marked difference between how the NHS and SCC communicate with people with additional needs. He highlighted that it was not clear in the letter that residents could call to make an appointment with the contractor. Residents report that contractors have been rigorously knocking on doors, not proactively displaying ID and causing residents to feel intimidated.
- 4.12 KM indicated the need for senior officers to act on these concerns. AA and TH issued an apology for the way the surveys have been conducted to date.
- 4.13 DM questioned how residents are currently empowered to participate in the surveys. ML responded that the surveys are not structured in this way. DM feels that, as such, the surveys are viewed by residents as surveillance.
- 4.14 DB indicated that considering the feedback from residents via ML and the comments of the Board, the Stock Condition Surveys are to be paused with immediate effect to ensure that required equalities considerations are met. **See action 9.**
- 4.15 DM has been sorry to hear about the impersonal process because people are not being put first. He added that the history behind people's feelings about SCC in GV means that the 'personal touch' needs to be in place.
- 4.16 DB said that contractors are also logging urgent repairs while completing surveys.



Employment, Skills & Enterprise – Laura Hayfield & John Powell

- 4.17 LH and JP provided a verbal summary of the workstream update circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 4.18 ME asked whether planning and development, and refurbishment and sustainability workstreams can be aligned with the strategy to grow employment and skills opportunities in the area. LH confirmed that this is already in progress, especially regarding retrofit apprenticeships.
- 4.19 DM highlighted that a lot of activity mentioned (Ann's Grove Primary, Heeley City Farm) is outside of GV and noted that this can be a barrier for many people.
- 4.20 DM explained that the church run a popular youth group, providing a safe space for children to do their homework. DM talked about the apathy of some parents towards supporting with homework and nurturing aspirations. DM cautioned against applying 'middle-class thinking' when exploring potential solutions. PT stated that people are ambitious within GV, but within the limitations of the environment that they are familiar with.
- 4.21 DM asked for more job fairs to be held in GV. JP explained that there has been a desire to hold more, but as of yet, there has not been the uptake. However, greater focus is being placed on engaging with difficult to reach communities and greater investment in this area.
- 4.22 PT explained that the creation of a physical 'jobs and skills' hub was included in previous drafts of the masterplan but was removed from the final version. PT thinks that this should be re-explored.

Community Engagement & Wellbeing (including community safety) – Carl Mullooly

- 4.23 CM provided a verbal summary of the workstream update circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 4.24 DM noted the omission of Holy Cross from the section about community partners who could bring additional capacity. AD noted the omission of the Play Partnership. **See action 10.**
- 4.25 ML commended forging greater links with Health services in GV through the workstream.

Green & Blue Spaces – Ruth Bell

- 4.26 RB provided a verbal summary of the workstream update circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 4.27 ME highlighted the need for more things which provide opportunities for young people, e.g. the creation of a skatepark and playgrounds. ME encouraged embracing the ethos of the Play Partnership and seeing through the eyes of children.
- 4.28 JS commended the litter picking initiatives but indicated that people do not want to engage with their surroundings because they are not safe places to be. JS stated that there are not enough police patrols and too little respect by some people for the area that they live in. JS and ME passed a written list of suggestions for improvements in the area to RB. This list comprised: good housing; access to playgroups, local shops, libraries; greater local police presence and reduction in crime; good public transport; and community support hubs.
- 4.29 AD recommended the improvement of wayfinding and signposting, forming connections through the green space. It would help to show that communities are not as far away from each other as people may think.
- 4.30 ML spoke about the fact that often action is taken to make an area look presentable and then it is quickly tarnished again.
- 4.31 JS highlighted the importance of engaging with children in GV to help change their attitudes towards the area they live in and build respect. JS referenced that lack of male role models/father figures for young children and



encouraged the formation of successful initiatives like the Young Gentlemen's Club to engage with young boys in particular.

- 4.32 DM spoke about the lack of safety in the area and the need for security cameras to be placed around the church; JS added that cameras help people to feel safe and encouraged the placement of additional mobile cameras around GV to help improve safety and the perception of safety.

Impact, Evaluation & Legacy – Dan Parry-King

- 4.33 In the interest of time and the late running of the Board meeting, PT proposed deferring items on the agenda. KM asked the Board for their view, and it was agreed to continue the meeting while acknowledging that the remaining items would have limited time for discussion so Board members should provide any comments or questions afterwards by email. **See action 11.**
- 4.34 DPK provided a verbal summary of the workstream. There were no questions from the Board in respect of this update.

5. Forward plan of Board meetings

- 5.1 MN spoke through the paper provided in advance of the meeting. He explained that plans are still in draft format at present and that things will be subject to change as the year develops.

6. Early Opportunities

Castelayn site disposal

- 6.1 MN outlined the opportunity to see new affordable housing built on the former SheffCare site which was recently demolished with funding from the Brownfield Land Release Fund. Additional detail provided within presentation circulated with minutes.
- 6.2 MN outlined the desire to place the site into the SCC programme for disposal of council-owned land for New Affordable Housing and the benefits of doing so, which includes providing decant capacity to support the first phase of redevelopment. This would provide an opportunity for a Housing Association to build on the land while SCC retains the ability to stipulate the mix of accommodation in order to meet the needs of tenants who are to be rehoused from blocks to be redeveloped through the regeneration programme and will make sure SCC has nomination rights.
- 6.3 MN spoke through the indicative timescale of the next steps, which would include launching tender process in summer 2025, completion of planning application in 2026, starting building in late 2026 at the earliest (probably 2027) and completion potentially in 2028.
- 6.4 MN explained that the rehousing policy may have to include compromises, because as the above highlights, it will be at least a three year wait if the Board and SCC wish to wait for completion of Castelayn before commencing rehousing from properties in line for remodelling or demolition.

7. Housing Services data & information

- 7.1 DB talked through the paper provided in advance of the meeting.
- 7.2 AD queried whether the data provided is for the GV masterplan area or the GV ward its entirety; DB confirmed that it reflects the masterplan area.
- 7.3 ML indicated a desire for the TARA to be involved in the workstream meetings and steering groups.
- 7.4 DB highlighted that voids data is in line with other areas of the city. He also said that he would like to review and correct the data relating to repairs and disrepair claims as it looks as if it may be incorrect. **See actions 1 and 13.**



8. Partner news, updates & any other business

8.1 PT requested that the Board has sight of the MUGA feasibility study and continues to progress the dedicated GV waste strategy.

8.2 In the absence of any other matters being raised as AOB, the meeting was drawn to a close at 8.30pm.

Actions

No:	Action:	Agenda item:	Who:
1.	Review minutes from meeting on 30 October 2024 for confidentiality issues before publishing and issuing to the public	Minutes & matters arising	MN / DPK
2.	Arrange a walkaround in GV for Board Members to visit key sites and gain a greater understanding of the challenges faced by the community	Minutes & matters arising	DPK
3.	Consider the lack of representation from certain communities and nationalities on the Board and how this could be addressed.	Minutes & matters arising	MN
4.	Ensure that face-to-face contact with residents is built into engagement plans and small achievements are shared with the community	Minutes & matters arising	QC
5.	Review May Connolly's position on the Board and update Scheme of Governance accordingly (if necessary)	Minutes & matters arising	AK
6.	Share GV Regen remuneration policy with Board once process has been finalised	Minutes & matters arising	IF/QC
7.	Review where responsibility lies in respect of the two-way review mechanism for the independent chair	Appointment of Independent Chair	DPK
8.	Provide Board members with an overview of the OPIL Hemsworth site, including the progress which was made and the rationale and procedures followed for ceasing delivery	Workstream update: Planning & Development	MN
9.	Pause Stock Condition Surveys with immediate effect and provide update at the next board meeting	Workstream update: Refurbishment & Sustainability	DB
10.	Include Holy Cross Church and the Play Partnership in the list of partners who could bring additional capacity to the community engagement, wellbeing and community safety workstream	Workstream update: Community Engagement, Wellbeing & Community Safety Workstream	QC
11.	The Board to review items 5 (Forward plan of Board meetings), 6 (Castelayn Site Disposal) and 7 (Housing Services and data information) and provide any comment and questions via email to enquiregleadlessvalley@sheffield.gov.uk	<i>Various</i>	ALL
12.	The Board to review the data provided by DB and outline what other metrics / comparisons they would like to see included in future reports	Housing Services and data information	ALL
13.	Review and correct any errors in the Housing Services information provided and incorporate into a dashboard of information for future meetings.	Housing Services and data information	DB
14.	Provide the Board with an update about the Spotswood MUGA and waste strategy	AOB	MN

