

Gleadless Valley

A great place to live and grow



Gleadless Valley Regeneration Board: Meeting Minutes

Date: 16 July 2025
Time: 14:00 – 16:00
Location: Terry Wright Community Centre, 569 Gleadless Road, Sheffield, S2 2BT
Independent Chair: Alexis Krachai

Board Members Present:

Kate Martin (via Teams until 14:50) 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 (joined at 14:53) 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	Louise Haigh MP (via Teams until 15:55) Labour Party, Local MP	LH
Cllr Tom Hunt Labour, Leader of Sheffield City Council (SCC)	TH	Ajman Ali (via Teams until 15:00) Executive Director, Operational Services, SCC	AA

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	Quintina Crozier Operations & Development Manager, Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team, SCC	QC
Laura Hayfield Head of Employment skills and Economy, SCC	LaH	Kim Swallowe Senior Architect, Capital Delivery Service, SCC	KS
Melanie Perkins Delivery Manager Architecture, Capital Delivery Service, SCC	MP		

Additional Attendees:

Kris Mackay Growing Circles (commissioned by Heeley Trust)	KrM		
--	-----	--	--

Agenda Items & Minutes:

1. Welcome & Introductions (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 02 June 2025.

4. Matters arising from previous minutes (Matthew Nimmo)

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

Environmental Stewardship Programme Funding

- 4.2 AK provided clarification on Action 2 from the previous meeting (relating to the Team Around the Place Environmental Stewardship Programme) to manage expectations, warning that the chance of obtaining third party funding is small. AK will need further information on the scope and ambition of the programme to better understand the funding and resources required before exploring third party funding options.

- 4.3 AA explained that in other areas of the city, Environmental Stewardship Programmes had received funding from Local Area Committees. AA also reiterated that the programme is a great way to support NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) youths into employment.

Team Around the Place Update

- 4.4 AA provided the following updates on the Team Around the Place model approved at the previous Board meeting:
- Mapping of early requirements has started, and an environmental toolkit will soon be going live providing a digital base for information.
 - Meetings across the Council and with Veolia have also begun to assess current resources and possible reallocation.
 - The team have begun looking into how the project can be funded and how existing resources can be used to decrease the level of funding needed.
 - They are looking to develop a dashboard to make information on the project more accessible.



- They have started to attend the Gleadless Valley Tenants & Residents Association (GV TARA) walkabouts to better understand problem hotspots and build problem profiles.

4.5 ME welcomed the introduction of the environmental toolkit and asked if it could be shared and where to find it when it goes live. DL informed the Board that the Local Area Committee will soon have a new website, separate from the Sheffield City Council website, which will either feature the environmental toolkit or link to it. This will be a publicly available resource.

4.6 AK asked for clarification on the resources and funding required but AA said they would be unable to quote a figure this early in the project. AA further explained that a Project Officer, possibly part-time, would be needed to support the project alongside systemic change in SCC to how teams operate within Gleadless Valley.

Action 1 – Team Around the Place Standard Agenda Item

4.7 AK reflected on why discussions about a 'Team Around the Place' model began, highlighting that many of the problems it aims to tackle are long-term, ongoing issues (e.g. anti-social behaviour, inconsiderate parking). As these are important to Gleadless Valley residents, AK proposed adding Team around the Place as a standard agenda item for future Board meetings so the Board can work collectively to achieve a 'gold standard' solution. This received no objections.

John O'Gaunt Options Paper & Engagement Plan

4.8 The revised John O'Gaunt papers were approved by the Board via circulation on 4 July 2025. AK thanked Council Officers for preparing the papers and invited comments and questions from the Board.

4.9 DM requested an update on the use of the Gleadless Valley Methodist Church (on Blackstock Road near the John O'Gaunt), referenced in Action 4 of the previous Board meeting. DPK explained that the Regeneration Team hope to start discussions soon with a new contact at the Sheffield Methodist Circuit after their previous contact had left.

Action 2 – Gleadless Valley Methodist Church

4.10 AK suggested a letter from LH as the local MP could help progress discussions with the Circuit to get the Gleadless Valley Methodist Church back into public use. LH and the Green Party local ward councillors present, ME and PT, agreed to attempt contact with the Circuit.

4.11 PT shared a previous experience with another Methodist church congregation and found that they had difficulty communicating with Circuit leaders and that decisions lacked prior consultation. Therefore, PT supported using LH's contacts to prompt action and AK concurred that a coordinated effort is needed to move forward.

4.12 AK summarised the remaining action updates. This included a meeting held on 14 July 2025 between PT and MN to discuss the play strategy.

5. Local Centres Analysis (Melanie Perkins, Kim Swallowe)

5.1 First, AK acknowledged that the time given to discuss this topic was not sufficient to explore all proposals and options and added that workshops can be set up later in the year if needed.

5.2 MP introduced the item and summarised the background information provided in the Local Centres Analysis report and maps circulated to members prior to the meeting.

5.3 KS provided a visual presentation of the constraints, issues and opportunities at the three proposed local centres: 1) Newfield Green; 2) Gaunt/Hemsworth; and 3) Herdings/Norton Aerodrome (slides to be circulated post-meeting). KS also noted that site visits and community workshops helped form the proposed area



boundaries which incorporate a wider area showing how people access the local centres. MN gave further information on the different options for each site:

1) Newfield Green

The main concerns noted for Newfield Green were safety (inc. road safety), underutilised spaces, and lack of play provision. The proposals include traffic calming measures, linking the gateways to existing public footpaths through the adjacent woodland, and adding incidental play areas along existing routes.

- **Option 1:** (High intervention) Development of high-density housing and creation of a vibrant, busy urban area to bring different types of residents in.
- **Option 2:** A focus on family housing with medium density low rise housing and replacement of shops and services with better buildings. Also, a focus on recreation.
- **Option 3:** (Low intervention) Less focus on demolishing and rebuilding existing amenities and housing and instead, a focus on improving the public realm and access with improvements to some buildings.

2) Gaunt & Hemsworth

The proposals involve connecting the two areas to create 1 local centre, with traffic calming measures down Blackstock Road and improving the access routes between the buildings and services and adjacent housing and public spaces.

- **Option 1a:** (High intervention) Retain local centre at Gaunt.
- **Option 1b:** (Low intervention) Retain local centre at Gaunt.
- **Option 2a:** (High intervention) New retail focus at Hemsworth with a community focus at Gaunt.
- **Option 2b:** (Low intervention) New retail focus at Hemsworth with a community focus at Gaunt.

A high intervention option would involve more major changes - more demolitions and rebuilding – whereas a low intervention would focus on improvements to existing buildings and facilities.

3) Herdings & Norton Aerodrome

The proposals include development on Norton Aerodrome to support the existing shops and facilities in Herdings and making better use of existing spaces. This would also involve improving the visibility and signage of the tram stop and to Herdings Park and maintaining key assets such as the boxing club and the community centre.

- **Option 1:** (High intervention) This option involves redevelopment of the retail area, major works to Norton Avenue to make it easier to cross between Herdings and Norton Aerodrome, investment into the park and redevelopment of the flats around the park.
- **Option 2:** (Low intervention) This option does not involve major works to the Herdings area and instead focuses on creating links to a new residential neighbourhood at Norton Aerodrome.

5.4 AK advised stakeholders to decide the level of ambition the Board will collectively work towards – for this Item and all future Items - to help with decision-making and ultimately make a demonstrative difference in Gleadless Valley.

5.5 PT said that the analysis showed the potential of Gleadless Valley, but it was difficult to see how decisions will be made. Due to the influence of finances when choosing between options, PT was concerned that either no decision would be made or that by default, the cheapest option would be selected. PT therefore questioned the Board and Council's ability to complete multi-million-pound upgrades in three separate local centres.

5.6 To help decide between low and high intervention options, DJ sought clarification on how significant the cost difference would be and whether the Board could, for example, opt for a low intervention option and move to a



high intervention option once funding is secured (i.e. does it have to be one or the other). In answer, MN said some things will be decided at the design stage and that final plans may incorporate a mix of options. The aim is to decide and refine the development brief to use when procuring developers.

- 5.7 ML advised that as high intervention options and demolitions may have a significant impact on residents that use existing services, the Board and Council need to use a careful, phased approach.
- 5.8 LH warned that there are too many options to carry out further feasibility work and that some are not realistically possible. Therefore, LH advised the Board to be more directive and decisive to ensure money is not spent unnecessarily on consultations and feasibility studies on unviable options.

Action 3 – Local Centres Workshop

- 5.9 AJ appreciated the design approach and the plans but asked Council Officers how members will be able to provide feedback on the briefs as a Board meeting does not provide enough time. In response, Board members supported arranging further workshops to allow time for options to be reviewed.
- 5.10 DM questioned whether the main aim of the local centres project was to benefit existing residents or attract new people to the area, and shared concerns that proposals would not help existing residents. DM therefore supported option 2 for Newfield Green - improving the retail area as well as housing - and suggested that the Paddock Hill site be used for new builds instead to conserve existing local facilities.
- 5.11 DM shared further concerns regarding the Herdings proposals and the possibility of 'selling the locals short' if investment goes towards new housing that is too expensive for existing residents. DM warned that bringing money in without benefitting local people could cause resentments.
- 5.12 ME suggested that linking Norton Aerodrome and Herdings could be positive if it brings more amenities to the communities in Herdings.
- 5.13 AA shared the following comments via the Microsoft Teams chat section:
Newfield Green
- Issues surrounding access to the woods should be addresses in the options for recreational purposes and to prevent anti-social behaviour, dumping cars etc. This behaviour is rampant behind the shops and needs managing.
 - A mixed tenure approach would be favourable.
 - Traffic management issues near the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) needs addressing as part of gateway works.

Herdings/Norton

- As it is proposed to re-configure the tram stop, there could be potential to extend the network to Meadowhead, but this would be a more long-term piece of work.
- 5.14 Due to the existing Co-operative store in Hemsworth, DM suggested that Gaunt should have a larger retail unit as residents struggle to travel between the two centres and many are not car owners. This concern also applied to Overend at the bottom of the 'dip' in the Valley, where people must travel uphill in either direction to buy food.
- 5.15 JS was concerned a supermarket would take money out of the local community and away from existing businesses, therefore causing financial instability in the future. DM added that it may also work against employment goals for Gleadless Valley. In response, DJ referenced a previous supermarket development at Spital Hill as an example where local businesses were not negatively affected, but it did not deliver the jobs that local people were promised.



- 5.16 PT advised against assuming businesses in Gleadless Valley belong to local residents and suggested instead that many are owned by people that live elsewhere in the city. Therefore, these may not be keeping money in Gleadless Valley.
- 5.17 Others were supportive of the addition of a supermarket due to the current lack of affordable, quality food in the area, with ML stating that a lack of facilities and a reliance on online shopping is bad for wellbeing and mental health. ME added that access to reasonably priced healthy food is an equalities issue and that it is unfair people in Gleadless Valley do not have this. As there is a small range of services currently, PT suggested a supermarket could help tackle food poverty and encourage healthy diets.
- 5.18 As the Board acknowledged that the current location of the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) on Blackstock Road is problematic, LJ suggested it could be moved to Norton Aerodrome and that a supermarket could also be sited there. LJ added that the benefits of this would be protecting the local businesses in Gaunt and Hemsworth and introducing new people to Gleadless Valley by attracting them to a gateway location.
- 5.19 To aid decision-making, AK proposed the Board work towards a shared set of principles about the 'functioning of the Valley'. This would aid conversations on local business and create a shared design language. DM suggested core principles would also help streamline conversations, for example, if 'locals first' was a core principle, it would speed up making decisions on housing mix and changes to local centres.
- 5.20 In addition to physical regeneration of the local centres, AJ advised that the most challenging part of the work would be getting the Gleadless Valley population to feel like one community while they define themselves as separate places.
- 5.21 Several Board members did not support Gaunt and Hemsworth becoming one local centre due to the travel distance and socio-economic disparities between them and instead would prefer them to be supported as two separate centres.
- 5.22 ME asked whether the playing field at Hemsworth is proposed to be retained due to existing planning requirements, to which KS confirmed that half the site is designated as a playing field. ME suggested the use designation may not completely restrict development and that options for the site should still be explored.
- 5.23 MR emphasised that Gleadless Valley needs to feel like one community. However, JS stressed that Gleadless Valley became split due to parts of the Valley being neglected whilst others weren't, causing a natural divide between different local areas and communities.
- 5.24 DM clarified that consideration of different retail areas for each local centre is being realistic about how far people can travel and does not come from a desire to separate communities.
- 5.25 AJ stated the Active Travel Plan needs to relate to the whole of the valley rather than just the local centres as it would be challenging to make people feel connected to the centres. In response, KS and MP assured the Board that the Transport Strategy would go beyond the local centres and would feed into the wider strategy, and that this work 'stitches into' the wider project. MN added that Arup is currently working on the transport strategy.

Action 4 – Transport Strategy Update

- 5.26 ME found the spatial mapping in the presentation useful but highlighted a need to see how the areas link together and to the rest of Sheffield. ME requested to hear an update from Arup at the next meeting to better understand the Transport Strategy.
- 5.27 AK reminded the Board that they have a collective responsibility, acknowledging that everyone has high ambitions for Gleadless Valley but need to generally quicken the pace. Therefore, AK advised Council Officers to be clear to consultants that they need to work fast to provide precise delivery plans and reiterated that money should not be spend on unnecessary feasibility studies.



5.28 AK and Board members raised concerns about both the lack of time for important agenda items and items that may be interconnected being viewed too separately, preventing effective decision making. Therefore, AK was not confident that the Board was in a position to discuss spending money on this project.

5.29 LJ supported these comments, referring to the difficulty experienced when trying to assure Facebook commenters that Regeneration is progressing. The consensus amongst Board members was that there is a lack of updates and information that can be given to local residents and communities, especially when trying to provide clarification on finances.

6. Employment, Skills and Enterprise and Wellbeing Strategy and Delivery Plan (Laura Hayfield)

6.1 LaH briefly summarised the Employment, Skills and Enterprise and Wellbeing (ESEW) Strategy and Delivery Plan circulated ahead of the meeting, and highlighted the following:

- Two workstreams (Employment, Skills & Enterprise and Health & Wellbeing) have been brought together as they need to be viewed in tandem; work can be good for health and conversely, poor health is increasingly a reason in Gleadless Valley for people to be out of work.
- An Officer has been appointed to oversee the delivery of the plan.
- The Council are seeking endorsement of the draft plan which will be refined through community and partner consultations.

6.2 ME felt the paper set out good long-term vision, but asked if current services would be included, for example, the employment skills hub at Heeley City Farm. LaH explained that the youth hub funded by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) has been successful at Heeley City Farm for over a year and has expanded this year to help adults. LaH also clarified that though recently the agreement with Heeley Trust to provide employment skills support has ceased, funding is being put into Heeley City Farm's hub to provide outreach services in Gleadless Valley.

6.3 In response to ME asking where the above employment support was being delivered, LaH and QC explained that as well as Heeley City Farm working out of a local school, a presence is being created at Gaunt. This is currently through the 189 Project at Gaunt Precinct and two more commercial units will be involved soon. Alongside possibly working with Regather, QC said this will result in expansion of the outreach work at Gaunt.

6.4 LJ detailed Newfield School's recent curriculum changes to improve the English and Mathematics provision to improve the Progress 8 scores of Gleadless Valley children. LJ therefore suggested that the GV TARA and the Board reach out to the school and feed this work into the ESEW Delivery Plan.

6.5 Though it was noted the changes have not been well received by all parents, LJ highlighted the potential for wider reaching support in schools to encourage children, future Gleadless Valley adults, into employment.

6.6 Concerns were raised by ML regarding recent staffing changes at Newfield School and levelling out disproportion in achievement between children with special needs and those without.

6.7 PT expressed a lack of confidence in Mercia Trust's ability to progress less able children to the same standard as more able children, in part due to their disciplinarian culture, but noted that school's hold a lot of valuable data that could be useful if shared.

6.8 JS said many children are out of school due to being excluded and raised concerns that they are falling behind. In addition, DM suggested many parents are disinterested in their children's education and a lack of ambition and aspirations is passed down from parent to child.

6.9 DM stressed the importance of afterschool/homework clubs and supported incorporating them into the ESEW Strategy. DM emphasised that clubs need to provide an opportunity for children to complete their homework as not every child is supported or able to do this at home.



Action 5 – Afterschool clubs in the ESEW Strategy & Delivery Plan

- 6.10 LaH acknowledged the link between local school curriculums and economic activity in Gleadless Valley but clarified that the Draft Plan is not an education strategy. LaH did propose, however, to include after school clubs and wrap around school provision in the plan.
- 6.11 AJ was supportive of the Strategy and Delivery Plan but thought it was lacking detail on how the work will be delivered, noting that short 12-month contracts should be avoided as they make long-term ambitions more difficult to achieve. Board members and LaH agreed that repeated 12-month contracts are a problem. AJ shared that Heeley Trust would be willing to help progress the paper into a meaningful action plan, working with the Gleadless Valley community.
- 6.12 DM thanked Officers for the huge amount of work and welcomed the inclusion of the mental health hub but raised concerns around relying on this as a complete objective. As the service will only run for a finite amount of time, DM recommended including a longer-term plan. DM added that a lot of people in the Gleadless Valley had physical health issues affecting their wellbeing and access to employment.
- 6.13 LaH shared that the UKSPF (UK Shared Prosperity Fund) which supports unemployed people with significant barriers to work is only funded for this year. Due to the uncertainty these short-term stints of funding cause, LaH concurred that it can prevent long term work. However, LaH did confirm that the Economic Inactivity Trailblazer will be in place until March 2027, and a new programme, Connect to Work, is funded up to 2030 and will support those with learning disabilities and/or autism.
- 6.14 Following the feedback from Board members, LaH surmised that services and plans were not sufficiently reflected in the Draft Plan.
- 6.15 QC thanked the Board for their comments and emphasised that is just the first draft. The next steps will be going to community and partners to explore how the plan can be achieved, including how we work collaboratively to bring in required resources, and how to lobby parliament to bring in funding. LaH suggested incorporating this into the engagement work carried out by Heeley Trust and conversations with Gleadless Valley communities and residents.

Action 6 – ESEW Delivery Plan Strategic Objectives

- 6.16 AK recommended inclusion of quantifiable achievements in the strategic objectives section. For example, clearly setting out whether the goal is to raise economic activity to the city average or the national average. AK emphasised the need to be clearer about what the Board and the Council are hoping to achieve and link to the economic objectives of the Regeneration Programme.

7. Engagement Plan (Kris Mackay, Andy Jackson)

- 7.1 Due to time constraints, KrM and AJ provided a shortened presentation of the Engagement Plan papers and Powerpoint slides circulated ahead of the meeting including the following:
- The first step in the structured approach is to build trust and confidence within the community.
 - Conversations that take place with Gleadless Valley residents often focus on individual lives and experiences, and there is a challenge to transform this information to drive meaningful change and decisions.
 - Heeley Trust is not in charge of engagement in the valley but work with SCC to create a shared framework. A set of shared purposes were also co-created by the Gleadless Valley Regeneration Team and Heeley Trust.
 - Big conversation: Heeley Trust will engage the community in a broad asset-based development approach. The aim is to support an ongoing 'big conversation' led by the community and involving key decision makers in the Regeneration programme.



- Clearer communication channels are to be provided. A Have Your Say Page is going live soon, which will be both a source of information for residents and feature surveys to gain feedback on Regeneration projects.
- The Board and Council should learn from other regeneration project and find ways to share practices between different places to achieve community led engagement.

- 7.2 AK encouraged Board members to participate in engagement as much as possible, emphasising the importance of being involved in conversations even when they are difficult.
- 7.3 With regards to building community trust and confidence, DM suggested everyone learned from Heeley Trust's methods. DM also felt there was a lack of communication from the Board and Regeneration Team with the Gleadless Valley community.
- 7.4 LJ was supportive of the engagement plan but advised everything being delivered by Heeley Trust was problematic, and that there was a lack of representation and opportunities for more local organisations. LJ shared that Gleadless Valley residents would be supportive a Gleadless Valley Trust which would reduce the appearance of relying on outside help.
- 7.5 JS warned that resentment towards Heeley Trust from local people would grow as they continue to engage on behalf of the Council, bypassing other local groups. DM reiterated the significance of Heeley Trust staff feeling like outside help to the Gleadless Valley community and that a lack of communication from the Regeneration Team did not help.
- 7.6 AD suggested overcoming challenges with public trust and communications by working with existing organisations such as the GV TARA, Holy Cross Church, SAVTE, Happy Saplings and Valley Youth Hub.
- 7.7 AJ assured the Board that Heeley Trust were invited to work in Gleadless Valley (by the previous chair of the GV TARA), interviewed before starting Gleadless Valley initiatives, are dedicated to the area and that all money raised or given towards Gleadless Valleys projects has been spent in the Valley. Heeley Trust would like to help either set up a Gleadless Valley trust or invite local people to build something new together.

Action 7 – Subgroup meeting: Gleadless Valley Trust

- 7.8 The Council and Heeley Trust were asked to commit to building a support network within Gleadless Valley providing ongoing support as part of the Renewal Plan. Therefore, AK proposed a subgroup meeting in September 2025 to discuss the creation of a Gleadless Valley Development Trust with an aim to decide what level ambition the group would have and actions to deliver it.
- 7.9 To maintain consistent communications using similar language, LS said it would be good to keep in touch with Heeley Trust. KrM responded positively as it would be an opportunity for shared learning.
- 7.10 JS was disappointed that after having four Board meetings so far, there was little progress to share with people in the community.
- 7.11 AK reminded Board members that everyone present has a large role in Gleadless Valley Regeneration programme communications and that they can always ask the Team for help.

Action 8 – Communications Workshop

- 7.12 Due to the frequency of comments and discussions surrounding communication and its importance, AK proposed a one-off workshop in September where all attendees take away actions. This would include a gap analysis to assess what is missing from existing communications to enable the development of a comprehensive, collaborative approach.



8. Scope of Renewal Plan (Matthew Nimmo)

- 8.1 AK explained that this is a Renewal Plan rather than a Delivery Plan because arguably you can't have a delivery plan until funding, or a very clear funding strategy is in place. A Renewal Plan is designed to set out a level of ambition and a clear approach to delivering that level of ambition.

Action 9 – Draft Renewal Plan

- 8.2 MN summarised the 'Scope of Renewal Plan' paper circulated ahead of the meeting and added that the plan will help view all projects and parts of the programme as one joined-up plan. MN explained the Renewal Plan will set out the level of aspiration, the programme vision, and a framework for each workstream summarising its role within the vision and the strategic goals. It will provide a place to see and understand all plans and projects in one place. The aim is to have the draft Renewal Plan ready for the November 2025 Board meeting.
- 8.3 TH showed appreciation for everything being linked together in one plan as there were concerns that 'work will be less than the sum of our parts' by the separation into distinct workstreams. As the Gleadless Valley estate was nationally and internationally significant when built, TH recommended pitching the Regeneration project as a nationally significant project with the aspiration of people wanting to live there. With a cohesive plan, existing residents can see ideas for real change and external people will be attracted to the area.

Action 10 – Additional Board Meeting in October 2025

- 8.4 As TH emphasised that this work needs to be done at pace, not tipping into 2026, AK put forward meeting monthly between the July meeting and the November meeting. An additional Board meeting will therefore be organised for October 2025.

Action 11 – Discussion re Draft Renewal Plan resources

- 8.5 AK also highlighted a need to review whether resources are sufficient to deliver the Draft Renewal Plan by November 2025. AK and TH to discuss.

'Renewal' vs 'Regeneration'

- 8.6 DM supported the creation of a Renewal Plan as opposed to an updated masterplan but asked why it isn't a 'Regeneration' Plan to standardise the phrasing across the programme.
- 8.7 AK and Board members discussed using 'Regeneration' vs 'Renewal' with AK raising concerns that 'Regeneration' may imply gentrification or unwanted change whilst 'Renewal' refers to a time when people wanted to live on the Gleadless Valley estate.
- 8.8 DM favoured keeping wording consistent, asking 'why not rebrand everything renewal'? LJ disagreed with a rebrand as the programme is known to Gleadless Valley residents as 'Regeneration' and would therefore look like a restart.
- 8.9 To find out what Gleadless Valley residents think, DM suggested carrying out surveys at local centres and LJ asked if the Regeneration Team could make a Facebook post.

Action 12 – Review of 'Renewal' Plan Title

- 8.10 Taking the Board's feedback into consideration, MN concluded that the name should be changed to 'Regeneration Plan' or that the name should be reviewed to explore alternative options.

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

Action 13 – Board presence at the GV TARA AGM

- 9.1 QC and AK requested Board presence at the upcoming GV TARA AGM on 4 August 2025, asking for two non-GV TARA Board members to attend. This will be coordinated via email.
- 9.2 AK thanked attendees and acknowledged the time restraints caused by too many agenda items.



- 9.3 QC reminded Board members that a Key Messages document will be circulated, providing a short summary of meeting topics and information that can be shared.
- 9.4 The meeting finished at 16:21.

Actions

No:	Action:	Agenda item:	Who:	Target date:
1	Team Around the Place: Team Around the Place will be a standard agenda item so the Board is provided with ongoing, regular updates.	4.7	MN/AK	09/09/2025
2	Gleadless Valley Methodist Church: LH and ward councillors to contact the Sheffield Methodist Circuit to progress conversations on bringing the building back into public use.	4.10	LH/PT/ME	09/09/2025
3	Local Centres Workshop: A workshop focussed on the Local Centre options will be arranged, giving Board members more time to review and respond.	5.9	KS/MP/MN	09/09/2025
4	Transport Strategy Update: Board members will be provided with an update on the Transport Strategy that Arup is working on.	5.26	MN	09/09/2025
5	ESEW Strategy and Delivery Plan – School clubs: Afterschool and homework clubs and wrap around school provision to be included in the ESEW Strategy and Delivery Plan.	6.10	QC/LH	09/09/2025
6	ESEW Strategy and Delivery Plan – Strategic Objectives: Strategic objectives to be updated to include quantifiable targets, including ambitions for increasing economic activity.	6.16	QC/LH	09/09/2025
7	Gleadless Valley Trust Subgroup meeting: A Board subgroup meeting will be arranged to begin working towards the creating of a Gleadless Valley Trust.	7.8	AK/QC/AJ	13/11/2025
8	Communications Workshop: A communications workshop will be arranged which all attendees will take away actions from to encourage a collaborative approach. This will include a gap analysis to assess what is missing from current comms.	7.12	QC	13/11/2025
9	Draft Renewal Plan	8.2	MN	13/11/2025



	The draft Renewal Plan will be prepared for the Board at the November 2025 meeting and the name will be reviewed.			
10	Additional Board Meeting in October 2025 To support preparing the draft Renewal Plan, an extra Board meeting will be held in October 2025.	8.4	AK/MN/SC	09/09/2025
11	Draft Renewal Plan Resources Discussion AK and TH to discuss whether SCC have the resources to deliver the Renewal Plan.	8.5	AK/TH	13/11/2025
12	Review of 'Renewal' Plan Title MN to review the title of the Plan and explore other options	8.10	MN	09/09/2025
13	Board Presence at the GV TARA AGM Two Board members to attend the GV TARA AGM on 04 August 2025.	9.1	QC/AK	04/08/2025

