

Gleadless Valley

A great place to live and grow

Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board: Meeting Minutes

Date: 24 March 2025
Time: 15:30 – 17:30
Location: Norton Sports Park, 289 Warminster Road, Norton Lees, Sheffield S8 8PS
Independent Chair: Alexis Krachai

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 <i>Joined online via Teams</i> | 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 Marieanne Elliot Green Party, Local Ward Councillor | ME |
| Lara Joyce Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association | LJ | Cllr Paul Turpin Green Party, Local Ward Councillor | PT |
| Matt Lawton Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association | ML | Cllr Alexi Dimond Green Party, Local Ward Councillor | AD |
| The Rt Hon Louise Haigh MP Labour, MP for Sheffield Heeley | LH | Andy Jackson Heeley Trust | AJ |

Council Officers Present:

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|----|
| Matthew Nimmo Head of Project Delivery – Estates Regeneration City Futures, 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 <i>Joined online via Teams</i> | 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 |
| John Woods Head of Design, Capital Delivery Service, SCC | JW | | |

Agenda Items & Minutes:

1. Welcome, expectations and the way ahead (Alexis Krachai)

- 1.1 AK welcomed the Board to the meeting. A round of introductions was conducted with those present in the room and with those joining via Microsoft Teams.
- 1.2 AK outlined his approach to leading the Board as the independent chair. It includes: acting with openness; taking responsibility for any mistakes he makes; achieving objectivity through spending time absorbing information and actively listening to partners and residents; a determination to see progress through scrutinising every contribution to the regeneration programme and questioning how it moves the programme forward.
- 1.3 AK reflected on the composition of the Board and the high calibre and position of Board members who can help make significant progress. He stated that the Board has strength in depth and that “the only thing that can get in our way is ourselves”.
- 1.4 AK spoke about the opportunity for the Board to be a national model of success through displaying collective responsibility for the regeneration programme. He stated that the Board’s role is not to act solely as a scrutiny committee but to drive the regeneration programme forward
- 1.5 The Board were invited to share any conflicts of interest. None were forthcoming.

2. Approval of previous minutes (Alexis Krachai)

- 2.1 The minutes were taken to be an accurate reflection of the meeting held on 16 January 2025 and were commended for their clarity.

3. Matters arising from previous minutes (Matthew Nimmo)

- 3.1 MN invited comment and questions from the Board in respect of the ‘matters arising update’ paper shared in advance of the meeting. It was noted that LH did not receive the papers at the same time as other members due to a clerical error.
- 3.2 It was noted by ML that the status section of the document contained two date errors which require amending.

Action 6 – remuneration policy

- 3.3 Regarding the circulation of the remuneration policy, ME welcomed its introduction but queried the provision of vouchers rather than cash for volunteers (in recognition of time contributed towards projects). ME requested a discussion regarding merits and disadvantages of both cash and vouchers.
- 3.4 QC responded that obtaining cash through SCC’s finance channels can be a highly drawn-out and difficult process; additionally the provision of cash could affect an individual’s tax or benefits status. ME suggested that individuals could be offered cash as standard, but provided with vouchers as an alternative form of remuneration if preferred. QC to ask partner individuals for their preferences and issue an update to the Board thereafter. **See action 1.**

Action 3 – Board diversity & representation

- 3.5 AD commented on the representation of women on the Board, especially considering May Connolly’s departure from Heeley Trust and the proposal that May no longer continues as Board member.



- 3.6 The potential for an equalities assessment of Board membership was discussed. MN noted that this would need to go beyond gender and consider all equalities protected characteristics including invisible ones.
- 3.7 AK stated his desire to ensure diversity on the board but avoid being tokenistic when making decisions on a reactive basis. He stated that there will always be reasons to invite more Board members to join, but there is a need to avoid the Board growing to the point where it becomes unable to function. As such, he would rather the Board undertakes a formal review of skills gaps and Board representation once a year via a thorough and robust process and proposed doing this for the first time in autumn 2025. **See action 2.**
- 3.8 In respect of May's departure, AJ stated that there is no need for Heeley Trust to have more than one representative attending meetings at this time. LJ stated that, as a female member of the Board, she does not feel under-represented in respect of gender.
- 3.9 ML requested that the Scheme of Governance for the Board is updated to reflect that the GV TARA has three Board members; the document currently states two. This motion was approved by the Board. **See action 3.**

Action 8 - OPIL Hemsworth project

- 3.10 PT sought further clarification regarding the OPIL Hemsworth spending, given that there is confusion regarding the contract with Kier.
- 3.11 PT explained that the full council meeting did not fully cover the issue, and the response from officers at the full council meeting did not adequately cover his question regarding a £2.8m payment to Kier.
- 3.12 KM offered to 'pull together all strands' of the OPIL Hemsworth discussion and discussion making, with MN to provide an update to the Board which covers recent Finance Committee decision relating to Kier. **See action 4.**

Action 9 – Stock Condition Surveys

- 3.13 LH noted that the matters arising document does not provide adequate detail about why the stock condition surveys were paused. LH also questioned whether there is claw back provision within the contract for poor performance. ML explained that the surveys were paused to ensure that vulnerable residents were suitably protected and supported with the process.
- 3.14 ML said that the desired access rate of 80% is likely to be unachievable, given he suspects many vulnerable tenants will continue to avoid permitting surveyors to enter their homes.
- 3.15 AK requested that Officers provide the Board with a more detailed update on the Stock Condition Surveys progress to date, remaining timelines, the risks, and any contractual clawback available regarding poor performance. **See action 5.**

4. Castelayn site disposal (Matthew Nimmo)

- 4.1 MN provided a verbal summary of the associated paper that was provided in advance of the meeting. The paper asked the Board to agree to include the former Castelayn care home site in the council's programme for 'Disposal of Council Owned Land for 100% Affordable Housing'.
- 4.2 MN outlined the advantages of the scheme, which include benefitting from economy of scale, being able to progress quickly, and the opportunity for SCC to stipulate how the developer should build on the site, in terms of type of tenure, property size etc. Setting the brief would be informed by a workshop with Board members (separate to the Board meeting). MN invited questions from the Board.
- 4.3 AD enquired about the land at Paddock Hill, which was demolished as part of the same Brownfield Land Release Fund programme and asked why this isn't also being considered for disposal. MN responded that the Paddock Hill site is situated close to Newfield Green, which has been identified as a strategic site for potential major change. As such, the regeneration team wish to complete an assessment of the wider opportunities for this area before the land is released for housing.



- 4.4 LH asked what assurances will be in place to ensure that Housing Associations comply with the stipulations outlined by SCC and how SCC can ensure that the benefits go back into Gleadless Valley.
- 4.5 MN responded that is uncommon for development contracts to provide absolute certainty that the project will be delivered entirely as outlined, but that there will be provisions built-in for SCC to withdraw from the contract if a developer deviates from the original agreement.
- 4.6 LH asked for further information about the type of contract conditions that will be set out by SCC. MN responded that nomination rights will be a key condition. Tenure and size of units will also likely form part of the agreement.
- 4.7 SM explained that what is proposed is procurement of a development partner to build what the council specifies on the land rather than selling off the land without input into what will be built; this will allow SCC to accept a bid that gives far greater certainty about the type of homes that will be provided. SM confirmed that procurement contracts will be site-specific when asked about this by LH.
- 4.8 PT asked whether forming a partnership with a developer could be better than the proposed route. He cited the negative example of Kier being procured for the OPIL Hemsworth site and the subsequent fallout; demonstrating that the procurement process is far from 'watertight'. PT added that any new development must prioritise building houses that residents can be rehoused into.
- 4.9 In response to the above, SM outlined that the Hemsworth OPIL procurement was entirely different as it involved SCC designing the scheme then procuring a **contractor** to build it for the council, with the council retaining ownership of the completed scheme. In that situation, any cost increases must be borne by the council. What is being proposed for Castelayn is procuring a **developer** who will design a scheme, get it approved by the council and then pay to build it out. On completion of the build, the land will be transferred to the developer who will own and manage the new homes.
- 4.10 DJ queried the timelines involved with the project, and asked whether the proposed workshop will have the adequate amount of time to feed back to the Board before the deadline for progressing through the Citywide Procurement Programmes. AK cautioned against assuming that there will not be enough time and MN indicated that there will be time for a workshop and if the Board feel that decisions from the Board workshop need whole Board approval, this could be done via circulation/email.
- 4.11 AK spoke about the need for the Board to agree a set of principles which can guide all decision making and agreements which are formed rather than developing principles on a site-by-site basis.
- 4.12 The Board provided their approval for Castelayn site to be included in the first round of council-wide procurement of registered provider partners. **See action 6 & 7.**
- 5. Board focus & workplan (Matthew Nimmo)**
- 5.1 MN outlined the contents of the accompanying 'Board focus & workplan' report which was provided in advance of the meeting. It was proposed that the Board's focus for the coming year will be on the following priority areas of work: housing refurbishment; capital projects delivery plan; neighbourhood management and 'confidence building'. The proposed objectives for the coming year were outlined as: 'demonstrate progress and build confidence' and 'agree a deliverable set of major capital projects'. Four priority areas for the Board to concentrate on over the coming year were proposed:
1. Housing refurbishment
 2. Capital projects delivery plan
 3. Neighbourhood management
 4. Confidence building

Neighbourhood management



- 5.2 In respect of Neighbourhood Management, ML said that it can be difficult to understand why 'simple things' are not being done. MR spoke about the grassed areas becoming 'sludge baths' because people continue to drive and park on them.
- 5.3 AD highlighted that the SCC estates team have had some success in billing those responsible for churning up the grass verges, but stated that there is a need for a better policy, especially because of the inconsistency between Estates and Amey over how to tackle this issue. DPK indicated that conversations are already progressing regarding the installation of discreet plastic matting to add structural integrity to the grass banks and knee high railings will be installed in some locations to prevent driving/parking.
- 5.4 DM raised a concern that the term 'Neighbourhood Management' could be viewed by residents as rather 'Big Brother' and suggested looking for an alternative term such as 'Community Environment' which would also capture the social wellbeing aspects of the problem.

Confidence building

- 5.5 DM stated that communications should be a priority across all areas, not just under the fourth priority of 'confidence building'. AK agreed that trust building should be spread across all priorities, and should become an enabling focus across housing refurbishment, capital projects delivery plan and neighbourhood management.

Capital projects delivery plan

- 5.6 AD welcomed the opportunity to use development on the Norton Aerodrome site as a way of generating investment in Gleadless Valley, but warned that we need to take residents with us in terms of including Norton Aerodrome in the Gleadless Valley regeneration programme. He also asked about the decision-making process for utilising Norton Aerodrome in this way given that it falls outside Gleadless Valley Ward and advised that we ensure the relevant local councillors are fully briefed and supportive. **See action 8.**

General comments

- 5.7 PT highlighted that at present, the priorities focus on the 'material' elements of delivery and that there is a need to recognise the more 'abstract' focuses, including community work, youth work, skills development etc. By including these, the Board would also be able to demonstrate that clear progress is being made. LH agreed with PT.
- 5.8 AK acknowledged the material nature of the priorities but agreed that the document could be clearer that the regeneration area is not only focused on 'bricks and mortar'.
- 5.9 JS commended the progress that has been made at Gaunt Shopping Centre through the Economic Recovery Fund. He added that it is much easier to gain trust through demonstrating that small things have been accomplished.
- 5.10 MN clarified that the four priorities are not designed to cover everything happening as part of the regeneration programme. Community projects and education, employment & skills development projects are intended to be encompassed by the 'confidence building' priority.
- 5.11 PT stated he recognises the need for eagerness and ambition, but that the priorities do not currently accurately encompass all that the Board is working towards.
- 5.12 DM recommended inclusion of a 'social wellbeing' focus. AK agreed that there is a need to avoid losing sight of the social economic glue across all areas.
- 5.13 It was agreed that MN is to update the paper to include a social wellbeing priority and to consider 'Building Confidence' as a cross-cutting theme rather than a priority. **See action 9**

6. Masterplan refresh - objectives and opportunities



- 6.1 MN introduced the item, outlined the purpose of the Masterplan Refresh Report and outlined five key questions for the Board to consider:
1. Does the report capture the right level of aspiration?
 2. What do you think are the strongest opportunities identified in the report?
 3. Are there additional opportunities or themes that need to be included?
 4. Is there anything that should not be included?
 5. Should we undertake any resident engagement at this stage on the guiding principles or opportunities or should we wait until we have developed project options?
- 6.2 JW presented the report. It was noted that a workshop with community leaders and voluntary organisations working in the valley had been held to feed into the report. AK invited comment from the Board in respect of the questions outlined above.
- 6.3 ML highlighted the declining bus network in GV but that franchising developments could help to reverse some of the decline.
- 6.4 AD said that he was pleased to see a lot of what Board members and other community leaders had raised was reflected within the report. He commended the increased focus on nurture and said that GV is not a good place to raise a family without this.
- 6.5 AD suggested that, should the report be published, the whiteboard image from page 6 is removed as it is impossible to read, and that the phrase “walking and wheeling” is updated to “walking, wheeling & cycling” to ensure consistency with other SCC documents. AD also recommended including reference to mental health and associated metrics in the health section.
- 6.6 AD also referenced the “Walking, wheeling & cycling” plan which has been co-developed by SCC and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority, and the investment opportunities that this could bring, including the opportunity to connect with Arbourthorne via active travel.
- 6.7 ML advised that particular attention should be paid to managing the messaging to residents around Norton Aerodrome developments.
- 6.8 DM commented on the lack of reference to older residents with the document. Due to a lack of viable transport options and the challenging topography, many older people end up ‘shut in’ to their homes.
- 6.9 DM suggested careful consideration of how Hemsworth and Gaunt are viewed alongside one another in the report. The levels of deprivation can vary significantly depending on location within this small area. DM advised caution against putting facilities in Hemsworth that may not serve Gaunt and Ironside. He also highlighted that owner occupiers tend to be more vocal about their needs, implying that this could be to the detriment of council tenants.
- 6.10 PT raised the risk that the introduction of a supermarket chain could have a negative effect on local retail businesses; as such there would need to be careful thought about which spaces are created for local businesses. PT also raised concerns about the introduction of new services such as coffee shops which could price out local people.
- 6.11 PT suggested exploring an extension of the tram network from Herdings to Dore, while acknowledging that this would be difficult to achieve.
- 6.12 PT spoke about the commissioned Woodland Management Plan which is now close to publication and should be linked into this report. ME also recommended working closely with William Fairhead and the Gleadless Valley Wildlife Trust.
- 6.13 In respect of connectivity and the landscape, ME highlighted that the report does not currently contain reference to the walking routes that children use to travel to school and advised that these should be added.



- 6.14 ME spoke about sustainability and going beyond looking only at sustainability within housing, including more detail about how it could be achieved in other areas such as schools.
- 6.15 LH commended the report and the level of detail included around specific areas such as the recreation hubs, but feels that others are too vague – e.g. details about the number of new homes, raising existing homes to EPC rating C. LH suggested being clearer within the Board and internally about exactly what we want to see achieved, although some of this detail may not be appropriate for public documents which concentrate on the principles.
- 6.16 LH referenced the Gleadless Valley Household Waste Recycling Centre and suggested including reference to its future within the plan. PT said that there have been discussions about building a tip on Lightwood, thus replacing the Blackstock Road site with something more modern.
- 6.17 PT advised that the local lettings policy needs to be retained within the report.
- 6.18 In respect of the waste management plan and wider Neighbourhood Management issues, AK would like to see a detailed draft action plan as soon as possible to start addressing issues. AA highlighted that different communities have different issues and requirements. AK responded that GV's plan will need to be holistic, including how to address behavioural change and roll-out enforcement. JS highlighted that a lot of fly tipping is a result of trade waste being turned away from the tip.
- 6.19 AK advised that a 'stop, start, continue' approach should be applied to all neighbourhood management issues i.e. identifying what is not working that we should stop doing, what we need to start doing and what is working and we should continue doing. **See action 10.**
- 6.20 AJ highlighted that the report does not contain reference to 15-minute cities and that this should be built in to ensure that people can access the services they need, both inside and outside of Gleadless Valley. Reference to the latter is currently lacking in the report; e.g. residents need to be enabled to travel to employment opportunities elsewhere in the city.
- 6.21 AJ also requested design standards are built into the report, so that the housing redevelopment strives for beauty and has the ambition of making the estate award winning once again.
- 6.22 AJ noted the absence of a Board member from health services and recommended their inclusion.
- 6.24 AK also suggested that residents should be given the opportunity to travel to other areas which have undergone successful regeneration projects, to help share with residents about what is possible.
- 6.25 AD highlighted the need to start identifying funding for the proposals and noted that the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority has earmarked 5% of its funds for impact investment; AD is on the Board of the Pensions Authority and is aware that they are recruiting an officer specifically to look at investment in affordable housing.
- 6.26 In terms of improved bus services and the funding available for these, it was suggested that these should be considered in conjunction with bus routes that children take to school, because ensuring children get to school safely and reliably will receive significant public support. KM responded that there is already a team in place working with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority; KM is part of the executive group which is currently exploring the overall governance of bus franchising.
- 6.27 DM highlighted that the presence of the recycling centre could result in a funding opportunity. The Gleadless Valley tip is one of Veolia's largest recycling plants and they could be providing funding from the corporate social responsibility budget back into Gleadless Valley.



- 6.28 AK recommended hosting a workshop focused on exploring all funding opportunities for investment in Gleadless Valley and inputting these into a holistic funding strategy. SM highlighted that the Castlegate development has its own funding board; DJ said that this has been helpful for the project. **See action 11.**
- 6.29 MN asked the Board how they would like to proceed, in respect of sharing the plan with the wider community or completing consultation. The Board agreed the plans are at too early a stage to be widely consulted on at this point, with reference being made to consultation fatigue. The time to consult is when more concrete proposals have been worked up.
- 6.30 DM asked about what can be shared with the public at this stage, given the importance of communication. AK agreed that a good way to close future meetings would be to agree on how and what will be communicated from in-meeting discussions. AK also advised that the Board should have communication principles put in place.
- 6.31 AJ highlighted that when it comes to sharing details of the report, the focus should be how the messages are communicated, acknowledging that it will take time to have meaningful conversations with the community. AJ added that people in Sheffield have forgotten what regeneration means, and as such getting people excited about regeneration again should be an important part of the process.
- 6.32 QC advocated for engaging the community as soon as possible and not to underestimate the power of the community to help shape plans, and that SCC should avoid spending too much time 'fine tuning' before talking to residents about the things that they would like to see happen in Gleadless Valley. AK acknowledged the need to strike the balance and that there is no reason not to discuss the emerging plans in conversations with the community.
- 7. Partner news, updates & any other business**
- 7.1 ML reminded the Board about the Gleadless Valley walkaround / site visits taking place on Thursday 27th March.
- 7.2 Date of next meeting: 2nd June 2025

Actions

| No: | Action: | Agenda item: | Who: | Target date: |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| 1. | Regarding the remuneration policy and the provision of vouchers to individuals as opposed to cash, QC to ask partner individuals for their preferences and issue an update to the Board thereafter regarding the potential for providing remuneration in the form of cash | Matters arising from previous minutes | QC | 30/04/25 |
| 2. | Review the Board composition once a year (first time in the autumn), looking at skills gaps and ensuring diverse representation. | Matters arising from previous minutes | MN/AK | 30/11/25 |
| 3. | Update Scheme of Governance document to reflect changes to the Board membership, in light of the Board approving the removal of May Connolly from the Board and formalisation of three TARA members being present at meeting. Updated Scheme of Governance to recirculated. | Matters arising from previous minutes | IF | 15/04/25 |
| 4. | Provide a further update to the Board regarding the recent Finance Committee approval of £2.8m Kier spending in relation to Hemsworth OPIL project | Matters arising from previous minutes | MN | 02/06/25 |
| 5. | Officers to provide the Board with a more detailed update on the Savills stock condition surveys progress to date, remaining timelines, the associated risks, and any contractual clawback regarding poor performance. | Matters arising from previous minutes | DPK | 04/04/25 |



| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|---------------------------------------|
| 6. | Schedule workshop for interested Board members to discuss key principles to include in the Castelayn development brief | Castelayn Site Disposal | MN | 13/06/25 |
| 7. | Following on from the Castelayn site disposals principles workshop, update the whole Board on the recommendations made before procurement of a development partner for the site commences | Castelayn Site Disposal | MN | 30/06/25 |
| 8. | Update risk register in respect of local ward councillor views about Norton Aerodrome development and discuss matter further with local councillors | Board focus & workplan | MN | 30/06/25 |
| 9. | Revise the 'Board focus and workplan' paper to include a social wellbeing priority and to consider 'Building Confidence' as a cross-cutting theme rather than a priority and circulate to Board members for approval | Board focus & workplan | MN | 30/04/25 |
| 10. | Develop a Neighbourhood Management action plan to address waste management and fly tipping, off-road parking, crime and anti-social behaviour, management of housing land, etc. | Masterplan refresh - objectives and opportunities | AA | Tbc following SCC review of resources |
| 11. | Organise a Board workshop to explore which grants and funding sources could be available to support the regeneration programme | Masterplan refresh - objectives and opportunities | MN | 30/06/25 |

