

Minutes of a meeting of the **CABINET** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Tuesday, 7 October 2014 at 6.30 pm.

PRESENT

G A Porter (Leader of the Council)

C N Worth (Deputy Leader of the Council)	M G Chandler	C J Lawton
P S Przyszlak (Deputy Leader)	R Gambba-Jones	G J Taylor
	H R Johnson	

Junior Portfolio Holders: A Casson, P E Coupland, S-A Slade and A R Woolf

The Chief Executive, Executive Director (Place) (S151), Public Protection Manager, Planning Manager and Corporate Improvement and Performance Team Leader, the Democratic Services and Legal Manager and the Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillor A Harrison (Chairman, Policy Development Panel), and Graham Scorthorne (South Lincolnshire Community and Voluntary Service).

In Attendance: Councillor B Alcock (Chairman, Performance Monitoring Panel), Councillor G R Aley (Chairman, Governance and Audit Committee and Chairman, Leisure Task Group) and Councillor A M Newton (Independent Group Leader).

Community Representatives: Councillor Reginald William George Boot (Parish Councils), Harry Drury (Chamber of Commerce), Councillor Roger Perkins (South Holland Citizens Advice Bureau) and Jim Tyner (Lincolnshire Police).

25. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2014 were signed by the Leader as a correct record.

26. MATTERS ARISING - GREATER LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP PROJECTS UPDATE

At the last meeting, consideration had been given to a report on the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership (GLEP) Projects. Updates were received on a number of the decisions that had been made, as detailed below:

1. That the development of outline business cases for Council led projects i) and ii) below for the next funding round of GLLEP Growth Deal and European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) bidding be approved – i) South Holland Business Growth and Employment Project (Crease Drove – Growth Deal); and ii) Grants4Growth Phase 2 (ERDF).

Action By

CABINET - 7 October 2014

- South Holland Business Growth and Employment Project (Crease Drove – Growth Deal) – The Portfolio Holder for Localism, Economic Development and Big Society advised that the Economic Development department had submitted an outline business case for the Crease Drove project and were still waiting to hear if this had been approved to go forward to the next full business case stage. The Economic Development department was working with Assets on the full business case so the Authority was ready to submit within the tight timescales set by the GLLEP programme for the next round of Growth deal funding. Should the bid not go forward in this round, a full business case was ready to take advantage of future rounds or alternative GLLEP funding sources.
 - Grants4Growth Phase 2 (ERDF) – The Portfolio Holder for Localism, Economic Development and Big Society reported that this outline business case had been submitted and would form part of the business support GLLEP Growth Hub programme, and was likely to be funded through the European Regional Development Fund (another LEP funding source). A full business case was currently being worked up ready for submission in early 2015 when the programme had been finally agreed with the EU and had been signed off with central government and UK LEPS.
2. That the partner led projects identified within the GLLEP Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and projects i), ii), iii) and iv) below that meet strategic SEP alignment priorities be supported by the Cabinet in priority order – i) Spalding Western Relief Road Phase 2 and 3; ii) Holbeach Campus; iii) Peppermint Junction; and iv) Rail Freight Interchange.
- The Portfolio Holder for Localism, Economic Development and Big Society confirmed that the above ranking order of SHDC priorities would be reflected in all future strategic documents and submissions.
3. That a potential project to provide and extend Spalding Town bus service be researched to ascertain if it met the criteria.
- The Portfolio Holder for Localism, Economic Development and Big Society advised that following some research, the Economic Development Manager had advised Councillor A Newton (who had raised the original question of GLLEP funding for an extension to Spalding bus services), that this type of project would not meet the GLLEP funding criteria due to its scale and nature. Economic Development

CABINET - 7 October 2014

officers were currently investigating any alternative sources of funding which may be able to assist.

4. That an update on the schedule for funding of Phase 1 of the Spalding Western Relief Road be provided to the next meeting of the Cabinet.
 - The Planning Manager provided the following update.

Work to develop and deliver the Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) has been ongoing for a number of years and pre-dates the adoption of the 2006 Local Plan. The main drivers presently centre on the need to deliver substantial housing growth to Spalding in tandem with achieving a long-term and realistic solution to mitigate the impact of additional mainline train services running through the town.

Phase 1 of the SWRR has outline consent and its delivery relies upon developer contributions associated with the delivery of Holland Park. In order to achieve early delivery, engagement with the County Council as highways authority and developer has been both key and has been highly constructive. The present position is that the County Council has agreed in principle to front-fund early delivery of Phase 1 with the developer refunding these costs in stages as the approved 2,250 houses and other associated development comes on-stream. Detailed work on route alignment and geophysical surveys has been undertaken and engineering drawings prepared by the County Council. These will be submitted to the Council very shortly as part of the Reserved Matters and condition-set associated with the outline consent. It is presently anticipated that, as a consequence of permission being recently granted for 312 houses accessed from The Broadway, construction work on housing will commence on site prior to Christmas. Once the detailed consent is granted for the precise alignment of Phase 1 to the SWRR this will enable it to be built and linked into the Primary Street approved as part of the first phase to Holland Park. Completion and opening of this section of the SWRR is required prior to the delivery of 500 houses. It is presently anticipated that this will occur in 2016/17.

Phase 2 to the SWRR, that section leading from Holland Park to Pinchbeck Road, is critical to both Spalding's longer-term growth ambitions and as a means of providing traffic relief to the town. It is identified as 'critical infrastructure' within the emerging South East Lincolnshire

CABINET - 7 October 2014

Local Plan and the route is identified by the County Council within LTP4 as one of its four County-wide priorities. Phase 2 of the SWRR (a combination of earlier iterations of a previously considered three-stage approach) would see the delivery of the remainder of the SWRR road, this including two further bridges, in its entirety. Further, Phase 2 would provide a longer-term solution to anticipated levels of growth in tandem with providing an overall solution to both present and predicted future levels of traffic flow and the anticipated level-crossing down-times associated with the upgrading of the mainline service running through the centre of town. A funding model is being developed in tandem with the County Council and this will need to include engagement with current landowners/potential developers, this again predicated on early delivery of the whole. As this critical piece of infrastructure is central to the delivery of anticipated growth in Spalding up to 2031, funding is equally critical. The estimated cost of the works associated with Phases 1 and 2 to the SWRR is in the region of £96m, so say £100m. Whilst the costs attributable to Phase 2 will again need to be borne by future anticipated growth a piecemeal approach to delivery ought ideally to be avoided and front-funding is highly likely to need to be supplemented with additional external funding in order to achieve in-time delivery.

Recognising all of the above, a Steering Group comprising officers of this Council and the County Council has met regularly for the past three years in order to monitor and plan project delivery. It is timely that a recent restructure at County has now combined, under one umbrella, strategic highways and planning functions. This presents the opportunity to embed delivery with Local Plan production as County are also partners in the Local Plan process.

The delivery of a further significant housing development in Spalding over the next 25 years would contribute substantially towards funding Phase 2 of the relief road but would, consequently, be likely to deliver little else. In recognition of this officers and County are presently working on identifying priorities within the County-wide and District-wide Infrastructure Delivery Plans. Phase 2 to the SWRR is recognised as one of the County's key priorities and its early delivery is seen as the stimulus to future growth of the District. Funding is critical to the process and, whatever form this takes, it requires a mechanism whereby Phase 2 to the SWRR is delivered prior to significant numbers of additional housing in order to better manage traffic within the town. At this stage it is difficult to

CABINET - 7 October 2014

predict what the final funding arrangements will be in detail. However front-funding, whether by the County Council/LEP or both in conjunction with others, with the developers refunding all or part in stages, is the only realistic method of achieving delivery of the whole. Clarity on delivery mechanisms and timescales will need to be provided prior to the Examination in Public of the emerging Local Plan. As a consequence, we are currently working on modelling and costing delivery mechanisms in tandem with the County Council and it is anticipated that the Planning Service will be in a position to provide greater clarity and advise Members accordingly early next year. For the present, it is fair to say that this is probably the Planning Services key priority in Spalding and one which it will continue to work on with County to deliver.

(The Planning Manager left the meeting at 6.40 pm, following discussion of this item.)

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

28. QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC UNDER CABINET PROCEDURE RULE 2.4

No questions were raised under Cabinet Procedure Rule 2.4.

29. MATTERS SUBJECT TO CALL-IN

There were no matters subject to call-in.

30. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING PANELS

Interim report of the Leisure Task Group

Consideration was given to the report of the Leisure Task Group containing recommendations which had been approved by the Policy Development and Performance Monitoring Panels.

The Performance Monitoring and Policy Development Panels had established the Joint Task Group on 30 April 2013. The Terms of Reference for the Task Group has been agreed at its first meeting on 21 January 2014, which were as follows:

- Establish what leisure provision the District Council presently provides, examining costs, resident satisfaction and competitiveness in order to identify ways of increasing

CABINET - 7 October 2014

income or reducing expenditure;

- To understand what the District Council wishes to provide and what the public and major employers need; and
- To examine the options for future provision either to be supplied by the Council, the private sector or shared management.

It had been agreed that the Leisure Task Group would provide an interim report to the Panels and Cabinet during the autumn of 2014, with the anticipation of a final report to Cabinet in February 2015.

The Chairman of the Task Group presented the interim report to the Cabinet, and the following issues were raised:

- Stating that the facilities were 'not fit for purpose' was not in context with some other comments within the report which stated that the facilities were well used. The language on this issue should therefore be reconsidered.
- The work of the Task Group was generally good, and where it was leading was helpful. The Authority had to be prepared in plenty of time before the current contract expired in 2018.
- Had the results of a previous review of leisure facilities undertaken in 2012 been utilised? The Authority should not duplicate work that had already been undertaken if some of this information was still valid.
- Had the Task Group looked into how a new/refurbished facility could be sustainable? The Chairman responded that consideration had been given to this when visiting other facilities and that this would be one of the areas in the next phase of the Task Group's work.
- One of the recommendations within the interim report was that a provisional sum be provided to the Task Group in the sum of £20,500 to allow a full consultation exercise to be carried out. Cabinet were concerned at this level of expenditure at this time and wanted further consideration of the previous research to take place.
- Care should be taken with questions to be asked of the public within the survey in order that expectations were not raised.
- Leisure facilities did not necessarily have to be provided by the local authority. Consideration should also be given to its provision by the private sector.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to including provision of new/refurbished leisure facilities within the Corporate Priorities, however, the Leader was uncomfortable including it here at the moment. He suggested that the

CABINET - 7 October 2014

Corporate Management Team look at the interim report and the issues raised within the discussion of it, that this be fed into the work of the Task Group, and that a further report be presented to the Cabinet in due course.

DECISION:

- a) That at present the interim report of the Leisure Task Group be noted for the work undertaken to date, but the recommendations not be accepted; and
- b) That the Corporate Management Team look at the interim report and the issues raised within the discussion of it, that this be fed into the work of the Task Group, and that a further report be presented to the Cabinet in due course.

(Other options considered:

- *To agree the interim report and its recommendations for approval without amendments; or*
- *Not to agree the interim report and its recommendations.*

Reasons for decision:

- *To inform Cabinet of the work of the Leisure Task Group to date; and*
- *To enable the Corporate Management Team to review the issues raised and to provide feedback to the Leisure Task Group prior to a further report being presented to Cabinet.*

(The Public Protection Manager left the meeting at 7.20pm, following discussion of this item.)

31. PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR QUARTER 1 2014-15

Consideration was given to the joint report of the Portfolio Holder for Internal Services, Performance and Business Development and the Executive Director of Commissioning and Governance which provided an update of delivery against the 2011-15 Corporate Plan for the period 1 April 2014 to 30 June 2014.

At the meeting of Cabinet on 10 June 2014, the Leader had requested that more relevant detail be added to the Performance report. This additional information was now included within the report.

Members questioned the poor performance in relation to the percentage of major planning applications determined within 13 weeks. It was confirmed that loss of personnel within the department and subsequent recruitment had caused a drop in performance. However, the department was working hard to rectify the situation and thus improve performance.

PA
GA
SF

AG
JK
MO'M
RW
PA
GA
SF
VT
LW

CABINET - 7 October 2014

The Portfolio Holder for Localism, Economic Development and Big Society clarified the following issues that had been raised at a recent meeting of the Performance Monitoring Panel:

- Holbeach Town Centre Regeneration – This concerned projects around the proposed Peppermint Junction roundabout and housing.
- CCTV – The system was currently being tested and it was hoped to be in place by the end of October/mid November. With regard to Parish Councils, once the system had been tested, they would be contacted to discuss locations.
- Anti-Social Behaviour – Inspector Tyner advised that training was currently taking place to ensure understanding of new legislation that replaced DPPOs (Designated Public Place Orders).

DECISION:

That the content of the report be noted.

(Other options considered:

- *Not to approve the recommendations; or*
- *To make recommendations for change*

Reasons for decision:

- *Reporting against the delivery of the Council's Corporate Priorities was good practice and part of the local government transparency agenda.)*

32. WRITE OFFS

Consideration was given to the joint report of the Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Finance and Strategic Planning and the Finance Manager which recommended writing off irrecoverable debts.

A breakdown of the individual debts were attached as item 11 within the agenda, which was not for publication by virtue of Paragraphs 1 (Information relating to any individual), 2 (Information which is likely to reveal the identity of any individual) and 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

Members agreed that only the principles of the report would be discussed and there was therefore no need for the meeting to go into private session.

KK

CABINET - 7 October 2014

Comment was made that in some instances, enforcement took too long and it was agreed that an explanation on this was needed.

DECISION:

That the following debts be written off:

MW

Council Tax	£15,067.48
Business Rates	£14,180.07
Accounts Receivable	£Nil
Former Tenant Arrears	£2,349.82
Housing Benefit Overpayments	£3,648.08
Total	£35,245.45

(Other options considered:

- *Do nothing; or*
- *Approve the recommendations with amendments*

Reasons for decision:

- *All recovery methods available had been considered and where appropriate pursued before making the decision to write off.)*

(The meeting ended at 7.35pm).

(End of minutes)

These minutes are published on Friday 10 October 2014. In accordance with the Council's Constitution the DECISIONS detailed above will, unless otherwise stated, come into force and may then be implemented on Monday 20 October 2014 (i.e. after the expiry of 5 working days from the date of publication of these minutes), unless during that period a notice which is signed by at least one member of the Council and complies with the requirements of Rules 15(b), (c) and (d) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules is served on the Democratic Services and Legal Manager requesting that the decision be called-in and the Democratic Services and Legal Manager approves the request for call-in. Where a decision is called-in it will firstly be considered by the Performance Monitoring Panel on a date to be fixed.

Any FINAL DECISIONS and any URGENT DECISIONS take effect immediately.

Any RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL detailed above will be submitted for consideration to the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday 15 October 2014.