

Gleadless Valley

A great place to live and grow



Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board: Meeting Minutes

Date: 02 June 2025
Time: 14:30 – 16:30
Location: Terry Wright Community Centre, 569 Gleadless Road, Sheffield, S2 2BT
Independent Chair: Alexis Krachai

Board Members Present:

Kate Martin Executive Director, City Futures, Sheffield City Council	KM	Cllr Douglas Johnson Green Party, Chair of the Housing & Policy Committee	DJ
John (Jock) Stevenson Gleadless Valley Foodbank	JS	Cllr Marieanne Elliot Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	ME
Rev David Middleton Holy Cross Church	DM	Cllr Paul Turpin Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	PT
Max Richardson Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	MR	Cllr Alexi Dimond Green Party, Local Ward Councillor	AD
Lara Joyce Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	LJ	Andy Jackson Heeley Trust	AJ
Matt Lawton Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association	ML		

Council Officers Present:

Matthew Nimmo Head of Project Delivery – Estates Regeneration City Futures, SCC	MN	Sean McClean Director of Regeneration & Development, SCC	SM
Leigh Sanders Media Relations Officer, SCC	LS	Dave Luck Head of Local Area Committee, SCC	DL
Siân Clayton (taking minutes) Senior Business Support Officer, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	SC	Ian Foster Project Support Officer, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	IF



Alex Westran Service Manager, Street Scene, SCC	AW	Ben Brailsford Assistant Director, Street Scene, SCC	BB
Richard Eyre Director, Street Scene, SCC	RE		

Additional Observer:

Anita Dell Office Manager for Louise Haigh MP	ADe		
---	-----	--	--

Agenda Items & Minutes:

1. Welcome (Alexis Krachai)

- 1.1 AK welcomed the Board to the meeting and a round of introductions was conducted.

2. Declarations of Interests (Alexis Krachai)

- 2.1 The Board were invited to share any conflicts of interest. None were forthcoming.

3. Approval of previous minutes (Alexis Krachai)

- 3.1 The minutes were taken to be an accurate reflection of the meeting held on 24 March 2025.

4. Matters arising from previous minutes (Alexis Krachai)

- 4.1 AK invited comments and questions in respect of the 'matters arising update' paper shared in advance of the meeting.

Communications

- 4.2 DM raised concerns about the lack of actions focused on prioritising communications. This was discussed at the previous Board meeting and DM commented that it was a 'missed opportunity' that no action came from it.
- 4.3 AK asked DM for suggestions for improving communications. In response, DM suggested making posters and flyers, and visiting people in the places that they gather to relay progress updates, details of where you can reach the Regeneration Team and ask all residents for their opinion.
- 4.4 DM stressed poor communication leads to loss of trust from the community especially for the Board and the Council's decision making. DM added that sharing information with residents before a decision is made is important and clear information before upcoming consultations, including how to get involved, is essential. AD agreed and recognised that all Board members have an interest and role to play in communicating with wider communities.
- 4.5 PT enquired about when the Regeneration Programme will be in a position to share concrete information with residents about certain projects. DM reiterated that early and clear communication is essential, to avoid residents feeling as though plans are a fait accompli.
- 4.6 JS agreed with DM's comments on the Council losing trust from Gleadless Valley residents and added that many residents are doubtful regeneration will occur.
- 4.7 AK summarised that both clear communication and the timing of communications is important and a priority for this Board. ML agreed and said that sometimes it can be too soon to talk to residents about certain topics. DM responded that 'you need to take people on the whole journey'.



Action 1 – Communications

- 4.8 ME suggested making Communications an item on the next agenda or having a separate workshop to have a longer, dedicated discussion.
- 4.9 AK acknowledged the importance of communications in all workstreams and that it cannot be treated as an afterthought. There is a need for a more rounded and ongoing communications plan. AK emphasised that all Board members have a role to play in communications.
- 5. Team Around the Place Gleadless Valley (Alex Westran)**
- 5.1 AW presented the 'Team Around the Place' model and explained that the approach would put residents as the central focus with an equal voice at the table alongside partners, local businesses, local councillors, Sheffield City Council staff and organisations such as Amey and Veolia.
- 5.2 The presentation then summarised the aims and reasons for using the model, the early opportunities and outputs, the long-term opportunities, and how the approach works towards creating safe neighbourhoods and enabling local ownership. (Presentation to be circulated post-meeting)
- 5.3 DM shared that the Gleadless Valley Partnership meeting - currently organised and chaired by Heeley Trust - incorporates a Neighbourhood Action Group with a wider group of partners. Therefore, a reimagining – or sensitive incorporating - of this could be appropriate for the Team Around the Place model's resident centred, multi-agency approach.
- 5.4 MR raised road safety and traffic concerns surrounding the Blackstock Road Household Waste Recycling Centre including the long queue of vehicles leading to dangerous overtaking, the blind bend, and the missing "No Right Turn" sign. Those present from the Gleadless Valley TARA reported they had received many complaints.
- 5.5 AD was supportive of introducing the model to Gleadless Valley and recommended attending the Gleadless Valley TARA walkabouts because the Council's Estates Team (who are in attendance), the TARA and the GV Litter Pickers have a wealth of existing knowledge on current problems and hotspots. This includes the problems with communal bins in maisonettes, fly-tipping and littering in The Lumb, and speeding off-road bikes.
- 5.6 AD said that a central coordinator for the Team Around the Place project would need 'clout'. AD also highlighted how much the community already do and that there would need to be an input of resources and support for them to do more.
- 5.7 AD suggested that better communication between stakeholders would help as there is currently an inconsistent approach to enforcement, e.g. currently council staff would try to take enforcement action against perpetrators whereas Amey staff would not.
- 5.8 DJ supports trialling the Team Around the Place model in Gleadless Valley and said it would be helped by the existing level of community support in the area.
- 5.9 DJ highlighted the need for good relationships between Council staff on the ground and Amey and Veolia, adding that extra resources may not always be needed but improved communication could help existing services. For example, replacement of missing bins can take weeks which can increase littering and fly-tipping.
- 5.10 ML detailed the frustrations that come from trying to solve problems on a piece of land that may have multiple owners or responsible parties and commented that the process is over-complicated. AW added that it is a city-wide issue, and the Street Scene team are currently in talks with Land Registry to improve access to land ownership information. AW also outlined that to achieve quicker solutions in future, maintenance and waste



management issues should be resolved by contracted workers regardless of the landowner or manager, and that finances could be arranged retrospectively.

- 5.11 DJ added that land ownership issues cause delays when repairing broken paving stones, which are assumed to be the responsibility of the Housing Team but are the responsibility of Amey, who may not prioritise the repairs.
- 5.12 ME supported DM's comments about the Gleadless Valley Partnership meetings and thanked AW for the presentation. ME supported the introduction of the Team Around the Place model but questioned if the size of Gleadless Valley would be a challenge.
- 5.13 AW explained that to enact the Team Around the Place approach, the Street Scene team would start with a deep dive of existing community structures and reach an understanding of existing problems. Furthermore, AW noted that Gleadless Valley is made up of multiple different communities that are in some ways disconnected but are still part of the same area. Understanding where the different community voices come from, and feeding this into the process, overcomes the large area.
- 5.14 ME asked if there would be more target hardening initiatives like CCTV and noted this has been problematic from a Council and police perspective in the past. BB explained that, though cameras are a deterrent, difficulty with accessing the cameras and the time needed to transfer footage to a computer is a significant barrier.
- 5.15 BB informed the Board that Street Scene are intending to redesign the process of requesting CCTV to ensure one route in for enquiries and implementing a site-specific assessment to decide whether CCTV is the right course of action and if so, a site visit to assess the best CCTV strategy.
- 5.16 AD raised how significant the problem of informal parking is in Gleadless Valley and suggested this could be helped by regularising certain land for parking alongside protecting other sites with signage or wooden bollards.
- 5.17 JS asked where people would park if they could no longer park on any grass verges and warned that this could result in all roads in the area being blocked by displaced vehicles. The Board agreed that parking on verges is a problem. AK acknowledged that sometimes the solution to one problem results in a new one. This wasn't to be complacent but to acknowledge the complexity of the decisions that need making.
- 5.18 RE said that the Team Around the Place model would bring multiple Council teams and stakeholders together to achieve a better overall solution.
- 5.19 PT commented that as car ownership across the Valley is lower than average, especially in poorer areas, the minority of car owners should not be able to park on verges and pavements blocking them for non-car owners.
- 5.20 AJ asked how much it would cost to use the Teams Around the Place model and achieve 'gold standard' and highlighted that existing resources could be used to make money go further.
- 5.21 With regards to financing the project, AW stated it was premature to cite a specific budget but listed some typical costs for a 'gold standard' approach:
- Temporary staffing costs for a Project Officer.
 - Permanent staffing costs for a Project Manager - estimated £45,000 a year.
 - Environmental Stewardship Team - £5,000 a month (this team would provide employment for local NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) 16–18-year-olds and be a responsive service to clear, maintain and improve open spaces).
- 5.22 DM thanked AW for acknowledging that Gleadless Valley was made up of very fractured, different communities and commented that this was important to recognise as the separate areas have differing problems and priorities to each other and to the rest of the city. DM added that a middle-class answer cannot



be applied to areas that 'need the basics' and that the demographics of Gleadless Valley demand a more careful view, including the need to provide community assets in each individual area.

- 5.23 AJ said that a single approach to the whole area had worked in Heeley. This could encourage people to aim for 'gold standard' in all parts of Gleadless Valley to ensure the whole place is cared for so communities would be brought together.
- 5.24 JS agreed that there should be a common goal across Gleadless Valley, but said the work must start in the poorest areas.
- 5.25 PT questioned how the Team Around the Place model would work where different responsibilities overlap and whether the Council could bring in new policies without rewriting contracts with contractors like Amey and Veolia.
- 5.26 BB informed the Board that the first Street Scene conference was held earlier in the year, attended by Amey, Veolia, the police and other relevant parties. The issues caused across the city by overlapping responsibilities was discussed here. BB confirmed a follow up event would be taking place later in the year, focusing on finding the simplest solutions to avoid waiting years for necessary contract renegotiations.
- 5.27 RE added that the creation of AW's role was part of the solution as it signals a change in culture of completing work and solving problems before then worrying about finding the responsible land manager.
- 5.28 AW highlighted that poor communications between Council teams and contractors can slow processes down. Problem should be resolved even if they have been reported to the wrong team. Solutions could include improvements to technology, accessing information, and both staff and land managers taking responsibility and ownership.
- 5.29 DM shared concerns regarding waste management and fly-tipping, highlighting the knock-on effect these had on residents taking pride in their environment, and stressed that joined up thinking is vital both geographically and psychologically.
- 5.30 KM was very supportive of the approach and offered support with uniting teams such as the multiple enforcement teams.
- 5.31 AK welcomed the idea of trialling the model in Gleadless Valley and added that the Board would be willing to help progress conversations to deliver a 'gold standard' service. AK encouraged the Street Scene team to reach out to the community representatives on the Board for support.

Action 2 – Funding of Environmental Stewardship Team

- 5.32 AK offered to investigate funding possibilities from partners across the city to help fund the Environmental Stewardship Team.
- 5.33 AD asked if Street Scene had ensured that South Yorkshire Police were involved in the Team Around the Place workstream and AW confirmed they would be.

Action 3 – Team Around the Place

- 5.34 AW to progress the proposals for a Team Around the Place approach in Gleadless Valley in line with the circulated workstream scoping document and the feedback from board members.

6. John O'Gaunt pub demolition (Matthew Nimmo)

- 6.1 MN gave a verbal summary of the options report and draft engagement plan shared in advance of the meeting and welcomed comments and questions.
- 6.2 ADe shared the following summarised feedback on behalf of Louise Haigh MP:



- Although Louise Haigh is not fundamentally against the building's demolition, it should not be demolished without a clear plan in place
- So far, Castelayn, Paddock Hill and now the John O'Gaunt will be taken away from the community and the Council cannot keep taking without giving back

- 6.3 JS agreed that it was not feasible to bring the pub back into use as a community facility but stressed the importance of sharing the future plans for the site ahead of any demolition works as this will likely be the first question from residents. JS emphasised how significant the John O'Gaunt pub was to the local community and that residents will be unhappy if the building is demolished without the Board and the Council being open about plans.
- 6.4 MN summarised that in the short-term, the Council would be giving back to the community by way of improvements to the Gaunt shop units and making these available for community activities by the 189 Project and others. MN added that waiting until a full, clear long-term plan for the site is developed would mean delaying demolition for an extended period.
- 6.5 PT said that local councillors have long backed the building's removal to prevent anti-social behaviour if it is not going to be in use. PT further remarked that the pub had been run well for the community prior to the landlord's passing.
- 6.6 PT questioned the £1.4 million cost of refurbishment quoted in the options report, suggesting that 2-3 similar buildings could be erected for the same cost. PT did however support the demolition of the building and using the site as a pocket park until a long-term use is decided.
- 6.7 ML and JS agreed the building needs to be demolished to prevent the further increase in anti-social behaviour on the site.
- 6.8 JS raised concerns about the lack of a community centre in the area and fears that the nearby Gleadless Valley Methodist Church's uncertain future could leave no community building for residents.
- 6.9 DJ said that as part of communications with the community, there needs to be clarity regarding the insurance money – i.e. whether it could have covered the full £1.4 million refurbishment cost and, if the pub is to be demolished, what will the rest be used for.
- 6.10 JS suggested building a community centre on the site to give local people hope and added that removing buildings without making improvements or reinvesting defeats the purpose of regeneration and loses public trust.
- 6.11 AD highlighted the opportunity for good communications and suggested alongside telling people when and why the building will be demolished, there is an opportunity to ask people what they want on the site afterwards. AD said there should be estimates ready for how long different options will take, and that the timeline could be condensed by asking the community before demolition works take place. JS agreed with these comments.
- 6.12 DM thanked AD and JS for their comments and supported the addition of a consultation with residents on options for the site. AK was less confident a consultation would work until there was absolute confidence all scenarios could be delivered. DM emphasised the need to bring the community on board.
- 6.13 AK clarified that the terms 'consultation', 'engagement' and 'communications' should not be used interchangeably and suggested it was especially important when we are consulting around options, engaging to get feedback or providing updates. It was important to be open to people but also manage expectations about how they can get involved in decision-making. LJ supported the demolition of the building alongside public engagement rather than consultation.



- 6.14 ADe suggested engagement with the public about the John O'Gaunt site could be done alongside future proposals for the local area and the Gaunt shops.
- 6.15 DM advised the use of the word 'demolition' is significant to Gleadless Valley residents, highlighting the need for sensitive communications.
- 6.16 With regards to encouraging community ownership of the future of the site, AJ suggested maintaining links with the building's history, using 'then and now' photos of the change process and celebrating the memory of previous landlords and what the building means to local people. AJ also supported the creation of a green space onsite to complement the existing services and facilities.
- 6.17 ADe reiterated that Louise Haigh MP would only support the demolition process with a forward plan in place.
- 6.18 DM supported using the site as a safe green space with children's activities as a meanwhile use, due to the popularity of the nearby play markers. DM warned that people will want to use the area for parking.
- 6.19 Referring to building back public trust in the Board and the Council, JS stressed that the project will not get the support of the public if they are not given details of future plans for the site.
- 6.20 AD highlighted a need for honesty when communicating site options to the public. Retaining the pub should not be provided as an option if it is not feasible. AD emphasised the need for clarity on how public comments and suggestions will inform decisions, and clear proposals for both the short-term and long-term use of the site.
- 6.21 AK clarified that the Board are not looking to consult residents on whether to demolish the pub or not. Instead, alongside releasing information regarding the demolition, there needs to be meaningful, engaging conversation around the use of the land including the 'meanwhile use' of green space and play. AD reiterated that when asking for the community's feedback, they need to be provided with options about what to do with the site rather than open questions.
- 6.22 RE recommended involving the incoming Gleadless Valley Park Ranger to assist with the creation of a green space and play area.
- 6.23 AK asked the Board what to do in the event the public get used to the 'meanwhile use' of the site. In response, SM stated that whatever comes along to replace it needs to be better for residents than the 'meanwhile use'.

Action 4 – John O'Gaunt Demolition Engagement Plan

- 6.24 MN to create a joined-up engagement plan, not just focusing on the demolition itself. The engagement plan should include how the demolition is being communicated and meaningful engagement regarding the 'meanwhile use' and future use of the site. Paper to be circulated to Board members before any further action is taken.

7. Castelayn site development brief (Matthew Nimmo)

- 7.1 AK thanked Board members who attended the Castelayn development workshop (23 May 2025). AK invited comments and questions on the proposed development brief criteria.
- 7.2 DM commended the brief for being helpful and clear but raised concerns regarding the mix of housing, suggesting only 10% of houses being 4-bedroom would be insufficient due to the number of larger families and those with children with special needs that require their own room.
- 7.3 A further concern raised by DM was that there was no reference to parking spaces alongside the two bike spaces per household. AD added that the brief should read "Two secure bike spaces".



7.4 MN clarified that parking requirements would be set out in the planning guidance that bidders will read alongside the development brief. In addition, ME said that what was discussed at the workshop was “two secure bike spaces alongside a vehicle space per household”.

7.5 DJ said it had been very useful to have the workshop, and the consensus of the Board was that focussed sessions for other parts of the Regeneration programme would be beneficial.

7.6 Other than the concerns raised above, the Board agreed with the development brief.

Action 5 – Castelayn site procurement

7.7 MN to progress procurement of a development partner for the Castelayn site based on the criteria set out in the draft development brief paper, with the exception of it being made clear that the two bike spaces per home should be secure bike spaces.

8. Board focus and workplan – updated version (Matthew Nimmo)

8.1 AK explained the paper sets out the strategic focuses of the Board and that changes had been made since the paper in March discussed at the previous Board meeting.

8.2 MN summarised the updates made including ‘social and economic wellbeing’ added as a priority and the ‘Team Around the Place’ workstream.

8.3 MN also noted that milestones had been added to the paper to enable Board accountability.

8.4 PT sought clarification on the progress of the development of a play facilities strategy and enquired about Board member involvement including whether it should have been brought as an item to the Board meeting. MN responded that the play facilities strategy is a priority within the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Delivery Plan and is being developed as part of the Landscape Strategy.

8.5 PT expressed their concerns about the lack of progress, especially regarding installation of a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) at Spotswood and mentioned that both DJ and the TARA had been requesting a MUGA in that location for a long time.

8.6 MN summarised the play facilities strategy progress, explaining that potential locations for recreational facilities had been identified and these were shown on the opportunities map presented at the previous Board meeting in March. MN outlined the next steps, including detailed studies for each location and an overall landscape strategy. MN confirmed that plans for play facilities will be brought back to the Board at appropriate stages.

8.7 PT suggested that a workshop focusing on play and green spaces could be productive following the positive attitude towards the Castelayn workshop. AK agreed with the usefulness of the workshop.

Action 6 – Follow-up meeting clarifying play strategy

8.8 AK suggested a follow-up discussion between AK, MN and PT to ensure adequate Board member involvement in the development of the play strategy.

9. Partner news, updates & any other business (Alexis Krachai)

Savill’s housing stock conditions surveys

9.1 ADe asked the following questions on behalf of Louise Haigh MP:

- Savills don’t look like they are close to their target of surveying 80% of the housing stock in Gleadless Valley. Has all work been completed?
- If the target is not reached, why weren’t they contractually obliged to hit the target?



- A recent assessment indicates the Repairs Team require further investment. What action is being taken in response to this and what are the timescales involved?
- How much more than the allocation £40 million ring-fenced budget will the refurbishments be expected to cost?

Action 7 – Questions from Louise Haigh MP

- 9.2 ADe to forward Louise Haigh MP's email containing the questions raised above to RE to take as action to coordinate answers with Ajman Ali (Executive Director, Operational Services, SCC).
- 9.3 DJ commented that problems with access for surveys were not surprising due to the poor communication and that residents should be given the courtesy to arrange the surveys at times that are suitable for them.

Housing Service data and information

- 9.4 Referring to the Housing Services data and information circulated in advance of the meeting, DM raised concerns about vacant properties that are deemed unfit to let being used to house survivors of domestic abuse which is unfair to those survivors. DM emphasised that these are vulnerable people that have experienced traumatic events, and they should not be put in sub-standard housing.

Action 8 – Housing for domestic abuse survivors

- 9.5 DJ agreed to take any information shared by DM to the Housing & Policy committee.
- 9.6 AK thanked members for attending and for their engagement, and the meeting ended at 16:31.



Actions

No:	Action:	Agenda item:	Who:	Target date:
1	Communications: Add an agenda item on the next Board meeting or set up a workshop to allow for a more in-depth discussion on communications.	4.8	MN/AK	16/07/2025
2	Funding of Environmental Stewardship Team: AK to explore funding options with partners across the city for an Environmental Stewardship Team for Gleadless Valley	5.32	AK	Ongoing, starting immediately
3	Team Around the Place: AW to progress the proposals for a Team Around the Place approach in Gleadless Valley in line with the circulated workstream scoping document and the feedback from board members.	5.34	AW	Ongoing, starting immediately
4	John O'Gaunt Demolition Engagement Plan: MN to draft a paper for the board setting out a revised engagement approach before any further action is taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicating why demolition is necessary. Engagement on the future of the space (both 'meanwhile' and long-term uses) prior to demolition Give some realistic options for what meanwhile use could happen on the site including green space and play Incorporate engagement around the history of the site. Explain that proposals are being developed for a longer-term redevelopment of the whole site. Commit to the principle of a community centre at Gaunt and explore potential uses of the Gleadless Valley Methodist Church 	6.24	MN	16/07/2025
5	Castelayn Site Procurement: MN to progress procurement of a development partner for the Castelayn site based on the criteria set out in the draft development brief paper, with the exception of it being made clear that the two bike spaces per home should be secure bike spaces.	7.7	MN	October 2025
6	Follow-up meeting to discuss play strategy: Meeting for AK, MN and PT to ensure adequate Board member involvement in the development of the play strategy.	8.8	AK/MN/PT	16/07/2025
7	Questions from Louise Haigh MP: ADe to forward Louise Haigh MP's question regarding the Savill stock condition surveys and the cost of refurbishments to RE to coordinate answers.	9.2	ADe/RE	16/07/2025
8	Housing for domestic abuse survivors: DM to check what information from re-housed domestic abuse survivors can be shared with the Housing & Policy Committee and then pass to DJ. DJ to discuss the concerns raised with the Housing & Policy committee	9.5	DM/DJ	31/07/2025

