

# Gleadless Valley

A great place to live and grow

## Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board: Meeting Minutes

**Date:** 30 October 2024  
**Time:** 18:00 – 19:30  
**Location:** Gleadless Valley Community Hub, Callow Place & Microsoft Teams  
**Chair:** Kate Martin, Executive Director, City Futures, Sheffield City Council

### Board Members Present:

<b>Kate Martin</b> Executive Director, City Futures, Sheffield City Council	KM	<b>Ajman Ali</b> Executive Director, Operational Services, Sheffield City Council	AA
<b>May Connolly</b> Heeley Trust	MC	<b>Cllr Tom Hunt</b> Labour, Leader of Sheffield City Council	TH
<b>Andy Jackson</b> Heeley Trust	AJ	<b>Cllr Douglas Johnson</b> Green Party, Chair of the Housing & Policy Committee	DJ
<b>John (Jock) Stevenson</b> Gleadless Valley Foodbank	JS	<b>Cllr Marianne Elliot</b> Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	ME
<b>Rev David Middleton</b> Holy Cross Church	DM	<b>Cllr Paul Turpin</b> Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	PT
<b>Max Richardson</b> Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	MR	<b>Rt Hon Louise Haigh MP</b> Labour Party, MP for Sheffield Heeley	LH
<b>Lara Joyce</b> Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	LJ		

### Council Officers Present:

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



<b>Quintina Crozier</b> Operations & Development Manager, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	QC	<b>Ian Foster (taking minutes)</b> Project Support Officer, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	IF
--	----	--	----

## 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 Matt Lawton, Gleadless Valley Tenants and Residents Association (GV TARA), and Cllr Alexi Dimond, with Cllr Marianne Elliott attending as deputy for Cllr Dimond.
- 1.3 KM invited the Board to declare any conflicts of interest, with none forthcoming.

### 2. Gleadless Valley Regeneration Programme (DPK / MN)

- 2.1 SM introduced the this item. DPK and MN presented an overview of progress to date. The update included: GV's history, its assets and the current challenges within the area; the background to the GV Masterplan and the stalling of housing improvements; and the proposed new approach approved at Strategy & Resources Committee on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2024. DPK acknowledged the frustrations in the local community at the lack of progress.
- 2.2 MN added that the situation that GV finds itself in - regarding the stalling of housing delivery – is not unusual for regeneration projects, and that in his professional experience, projects often find themselves in periods of 'stopping and rethinking'.
- 2.3 KM invited reflections from the Board on progress to date and the proposed new approach.
- 2.4 TH acknowledged the difficulties that the project has faced and expressed a strong desire to rebuild trust and confidence with the people of GV.
- 2.5 TH expressed that a partnership approach (working with community organisations, strategic partners and investors) is the right way forward. He reflected that local Government is 'privileged' as it 'sees the whole picture', rather than having to focus on single-topic issues in isolation.
- 2.6 TH provided a commitment to producing a delivery plan and putting it in place as quickly as possible, and to promptly begin conversations with potential building and investment partners.
- 2.7 LH thanked TH and DJ for their attendance and involvement in their capacity as Leader of the Council and Chair of the Housing Policy Committee respectively.
- 2.8 LH expressed that the residents of GV have been badly let down and their hopes have been repeatedly raised and then dashed. As such, clear and consistent communications are now required as soon as possible for residents, especially regarding expectations and timelines. LH hopes that there will be clear milestones and target dates for when progress can be expected by.
- 2.9 LH agreed with TH's sentiments that local authorities are able to witness the 'whole picture', but outlined the need for SCC to leverage input from other parts of government. She highlighted the Mayoral Combined Authority's Growth Plan and expressed a desire to see this at the heart of the regeneration work in GV.
- 2.10 LH referenced the autumn statement and significant funding being made available for building new homes and encouraged partnering with Housing Associations, Homes England and commercial housing providers to access funding for new homes.



- 2.11 ME enquired about MN's use of words such as 'unlocking' and 'being more ambitious' with the new approach, given the large geographical scale of the area being regenerated and that other regeneration projects are much smaller in size. ME asked whether honesty is at the core of the new approach. MN responded that the size of GV is challenging, but that often when entire estates are regenerated, first phases are delivered initially and then the overall plan may change. As such, a tactical approach can be applied to GV which concentrates on delivering the early phases within a long term vision for the whole of the valley, while acknowledging that the details of future phases could be subject to change.
- 2.12 KM added that a large-scale regeneration approach can have advantages in respect of leveraging investments. Capital grants and community funds can favour larger projects, and it can be easier to secure longer-term investments. However, smaller local investments for specific areas can still be sought alongside larger opportunities, meaning that the project can benefit from both a large-scale and smaller-scale approach.
- 2.13 DM commented that community partners previously felt like an 'add-on' to the council, but they are now starting to feel more involved. DM believes that the most important thing is how the regeneration work is communicated to the community.
- 2.14 DM indicated that housing is the most significant issue consistently raised by the community, and spoke about the extremely poor conditions that so many residents are experiencing. DM requested that housing improvements remain the focus of the regeneration work and cautioned against imposing an 'middle-class' vision and ideal onto GV.
- 2.15 DM highlighted that the community is currently divided and fractured and that people are disinclined to mix or cannot mix together, due to the infrastructural challenges with GV. Often families are from a single generation, with people moving on quickly from the area, and people experiencing multiple difficulties before they move to GV.
- 2.16 MR referenced the amount of neglect and lack of maintenance on properties, e.g. paint work was previously being redone every seven years; it has now been years since this took place. MR highlighted common place leaks within the maisonettes, but referenced backdated repairs now being completed on these blocks.
- 2.17 PT stated that many aspects of the new approach presented by MN are already included within the Masterplan, such as the development of green spaces, which he and others previously advocated for inclusion.
- 2.18 PT referenced a previous indication by a former Member of the Cabinet, who suggested that there was a desire to scrap the Masterplan or deliver 'just enough' to avoid having to return money to Government.
- 2.19 PT highlighted the previous desire of councillors, when drawing up the Masterplan, to ensure that GV does not become 'privatised' through the types of new homes built.
- 2.20 PT stated that he is very disappointed with the decision to remove funding for GV from the Stock Increase Programme. PT feels as though there was deception in the way that the funds were omitted from the budget. PT added that there has been a lack of investment in general maintenance in GV because of a desire to 'wait until the Masterplan is delivered'.
- 2.21 TH responded that he could not comment of statements by previous Committee Members. TH became involved in conversations last year due to becoming aware that progress had stalled. TH reiterated that it is now clear that other investment will be needed alongside funding from SCC; and that internally teams are being equipped with the resource needed to hold such conversations. TH would like to see GV become a model example of how investment can be secured and deployed, which can then be replicated across the city.
- 2.22 MR suggested that Members of the Board should be encouraged to visit GV for a 'walkaround'. KM agreed to action this suggestion.



2.23 DM encouraged actively investing in communications with residents; in the past there has been a reluctance to pay for mailings, but frequent updates would help residents to take the project seriously. KM agreed that efforts should be made to reach all communities within GV through a variety of communication methods.

### **3. Regeneration Board Scheme of Governance**

3.1 A copy of the Scheme of Governance was circulated alongside the meeting agenda. MN provided an overview of the key areas of the Scheme of Governance: the governance structure, purpose and objectives, membership and procedures.

3.2 The governance structure contains six workstreams: Planning & Development; Refurbishment & Sustainability; Green & Blue Spaces; Employment, Skills & Enterprise; Community Engagement & Wellbeing (including safety); and Impact, Evaluation & Legacy.

3.3 The workstream leads will report into two groups that structurally sit above them: the Gleadless Valley Delivery Group (comprised of SCC officers and potentially delivery partners, e.g. housing association representation) and the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board (comprised of senior SCC officers and community partners). The Delivery Group will play a more active role in holding the workstreams to account and focus on process / delivery, while the Regeneration Board will be more focused on the overall vision / strategy.

3.4 MN indicated that there are still opportunities for amendments to be made to the governance structure.

3.5 MN outlined the objectives of the board and the procedures. KM invited comments and questions regarding the document.

3.6 PT queried which Members have voting rights; MN responded that it will only be those named within the first table in the membership section of the document.

3.7 PT advocated for all three local ward councillors to have representation on the Board; this was seconded by ME. This recommendation was approved.

3.8 AA recommended including a stipulation that the meeting must have representation from both SCC officers and local partners to constitute an official meeting. This recommendation was approved.

3.9 There was confusion regarding the appointment of two people from the Gleadless Valley Partnership; it was clarified by MN that the report contained an error which will be amended to reflect that DM and JS are the Members representing the Gleadless Valley Partnership.

3.10 It was recommended that both MC and AP from Heeley Trust should be Board Members, rather than act as alternates. This recommendation was approved.

3.11 MR asked for reassurance of the TARA's membership on the Board. KM recommended that their inclusion is emphasised.

3.12 ME queried whether floating membership will be available; KM clarified that guests will be able to join the meeting, such as speakers and workstream leads.

3.13 SM indicated that the GV Scheme of Governance is largely the same as Schemes of Governance for other regeneration projects in the city. SM highlighted it is within the Board's remit to recruit other Members that they feel are appropriate for inclusion.

3.14 PT queried whether Richard Eyre (Director of Streetscene and Regulation at the council) should be present at Board meetings, given the desire to develop a new waste strategy which meets the unique needs of GV. AA offered to represent and respond to matters of this nature in his capacity as Operational Services Executive Director. SM added that Richard Eyre could also be involved in the relevant workstreams and/or via the GV Delivery Group formed of senior SCC executives.



- 3.15 KM indicated that part of the Regeneration Board's remit is to task the working groups with matters which should be explored, and the bespoke waste management strategy is a strong example of what can be reviewed, adapted and developed for the future.
- 3.16 DM highlighted that Viola could be approached for investment support given their prominent position within GV and that they often indicate a desire to invest in the city.
- 3.17 DM questioned the frequent reference in this meeting to the Gleadless Valley Masterplan, given the shift in recent years to towards referring to the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Project instead. TH clarified that, overall, the work being undertaken is a regeneration project, but the Masterplan was a tool created to help regenerate the area. As part of the work to 'refresh' the Masterplan, it may be agreed to call the Masterplan by a different name. DM added that stepping away from the Masterplan will show that 'we are moving forwards not backwards'.
- 3.18 JS stated that the main issue within the community has been a lack of clear communication. People have completely lost trust in the process, and that this must be rebuilt as soon as possible. JS left the meeting.

#### **4. Independent Chair**

- 4.1 The Draft Independent Chair Advert which was circulated in advance of the meeting was taken as read. KM provided an overview of the document, including the role and purpose of the Chair.
- 4.2 The intention is for the recruitment process to be undertaken as soon as possible, with the independent chair being in post by the next meeting.
- 4.3 PT asked how much the role will be paid and whether the role had already been informally advertised given an email previously stated that there had been 'a lot of interest in the role'. SM clarified that the email referred to people being interested in the appointment process, rather than declaring their interest in applying for the position. The role has not yet been promoted in any way.
- 4.4 In response to a query from ME regarding promotion, the intention is to promote the role through Voluntary Action Sheffield (VAS), the Gleadless Valley Facebook page and through writing to all partners and asking them to share the role if possible.
- 4.5 PT stated that the role is very specific about the type of person who should apply and that this could be detrimental to finding someone to perform the role, given that there will be a very small pool of candidates who meet the criteria.
- 4.6 DM suggested that the criteria could be broadened to include people who have experience of working with or living in an area with similar challenges and characteristics to Gleadless Valley. AA cautioned against being seen to be excluding people from similar areas elsewhere in the city, i.e. from an equalities perspective. The Board agreed to broaden this requirement accordingly.
- 4.7 The need for training and support for the appointed candidate was highlighted by AJ, given the challenges of chairing a board, overseeing the associated processes and driving them forward. MC spoke about the opportunities for 'reverse mentoring'. MC added that some candidates will have strengths in running a Board meeting from a practical perspective, while for others, their strengths may lie in bringing people together and forming working partnerships.
- 4.8 There was a broad discussion regarding the extent to which candidates can be independent. AJ spoke about the fact that Heeley Trust representatives would not be impartial, given their dependence on local authority funding and power imbalances. KM concluded that the definition of the 'independent' in this context means that the candidate should not be a SCC officer or from a political party, thus it would be appropriate for representatives from Heeley Trust to apply.



- 4.9 DJ asked about the definition of remuneration, given the possible varied interpretations of this. AA responded that the remuneration is linked to benchmarking for other similar roles in the city. The Board agreed that greater clarity should be provided within the role specification regarding remuneration.
- 4.10 AA queried reference to an 'informal interview process' and recommended, given the very prescriptive role specification, that there should be a 'rigorous' process for appointment. The Board agreed to reflect this change in the role specification.
- 4.11 TH recommended softening the language regarding skills and experience (e.g. instead of the current wording, referring to 'here are some of the types of qualities that we would like to see') and that potential candidates could be encouraged to write 1,000 words about why they think that they would be right person for the role. MC added that this could also take a form of a short video clip.
- 4.12 The appointment process was approved, notwithstanding the comments provided above.
- 4.13 MR highlighted the multinational nature of GV and his surprise at lack of representation from these communities on the Board. KM agreed that this should be explored so that the Board composition more closely reflects GV as a whole.
- 4.14 It was agreed that four people should be appointed to form the appointment panel, ensuring that there is a balance in terms of genders, equalities, community partners and political affiliation.

## **5. Reflections from the Board and future meetings (All)**

- 5.1 The next meeting's agenda should include: an update on the independent chair progress; an update from the six individual workstream; and a deep-dive focus on housing management issues.
- 5.2 AJ recommended ensuring that future meetings do not only focus on immediate issues such as housing management, instead ensuring that time is also dedicated to discussing the overall aims and vision for GV.
- 5.3 In respect of reflections from the Board, LJ said that while much of the meeting has been about the vision for the future, there is a need to consider the current state that residents find themselves in regarding conflicting messaging from SCC regarding demolition and remodelling. LJ is conscious that this group of people should be communicated with directly, with a view to establishing what support they need, adding that people with 'an axe over their head...' 'do not care' about much of what was discussed in this meeting.
- 5.4 DM and KM agreed, with DM stating that the community should be told as soon as possible what will be happening and what won't be happening, given that people have already been waiting too long. TH stated that there is an 'urgent need' to contact people about what is happening to their properties.
- 5.5 AA indicated the need to tailor the regeneration approach to achieve something that really meets the needs of the community, so that GV is not simply a 'stepping stone' area.
- 5.5 DJ spoke about the need to ensure that new social housing is built in GV before anyone is asked to leave their homes; from DJ's experience rehousing residents out of the area with a 'right to return' does not work because they do not then typically return to the community once building is completed. PT stated that the stipulation for new housing to be available before rehousing commences was included in the local lettings policy as part of the original Masterplan discussions. TH cautioned that while there will be a desire to facilitate this where possible, the Board should be mindful of what is viable.

## **6. Date of next meeting**

- 6.1 The date of the next meeting is yet to be determined but will likely during w/c 13<sup>th</sup> January.

## **7. AOB**

- 7.1 DPK asked the Board for feedback regarding the meeting location; DM kindly offered to host the next meeting at Holy Cross Church (diary permitting) and the Board agreed that the meeting should be hosted across GV rather than at the same venue each time.



7.2 In the absence of any other matters being raised as AOB, the meeting was drawn to a close at 7.40pm.

### Actions

Number:	Action:	Agenda item:	Who:	Status:
1.	Arrange a walkaround in GV for Board Members to visit key sites and gain a greater understanding of the challenges faced by the community	Gleadless Valley Regeneration Programme	DPK	
2.	Update Scheme of Governance Board membership to reflect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- membership for all three local ward councillors</li> <li>- the need for representation from SCC officers and partner Members to constitute a quorate meeting</li> <li>- misleading error causing confusion regarding membership from the Gleadless Valley Partnership</li> <li>- membership for Andy Jackson and May Connolly</li> <li>- the ability of Board members to send substitutes from their organisation if they are unable to attend</li> <li>- floating membership available for guest speakers</li> </ul>	Scheme of Governance	MN	
3.	Ensure that communications provide clarity about the difference between the Masterplan and the regeneration project overall, in a way in which it is easy for residents to understand.	Scheme of Governance	MN/DPK/ QC	
4.	Update the Independent Chair advert to reflect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- candidates must have experience of working with or be from areas which share similar characteristics with GV</li> <li>- a clearer definition of the term 'Independent'</li> <li>- the emphasis on training and support being provided to the selected candidate</li> <li>- the possibility of co-chairing based on candidates offering different skill sets (see 4.7)</li> <li>- greater emphasis on a rigorous recruitment process (i.e. amending reference to an 'informal interview')</li> <li>- softer language about the types of skills required</li> <li>- application can be via short 1,000 statement or submission of a video clip</li> </ul> <p><b>Deadline:</b> recirculate by 01/11/2024</p>	Independent Chair	DPK	Recirculated by IF on 01/11/24
5.	Consider the lack of representation from certain communities and nationalities on the Board and how this could be addressed	Independent Chair	MN / DPK	
6.	Share messaging about demolition and remodelling as soon as possible	Reflections from the Board and future meetings	MN/DPK/ QC	Letters to potential demolition / remodelling residents sent in Aug 2024
7.	Arrange for each individual workstream lead to present at the next Board meeting. Each workstream to produce paper updates which can be shared in advance and taken as read during the meeting	Reflections from the Board and future meetings	DPK/IF	

