

MINUTES

CABINET

23 OCTOBER 2012

Present:

Members:

Councillors:

Terry Douris	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration
Margaret Griffiths	Portfolio Holder for Housing
Neil Harden	Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services
Julie Laws	Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability
Nick Tiley	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources
Andrew Williams (Chairman)	Leader of the Council

Officers:

Daniel Zammit	Chief Executive
Mark Gaynor	Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration)
Sally Marshall	Corporate Director (Finance and Governance)
Steven Baker	Assistant Director (Legal Democratic and Regulatory)
Elliot Brooks	Assistant Director (Housing Landlord)
James Doe	Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration)
Shane Flynn	Assistant Director (Finance and Resources)
Jim Doyle	Group Manager (Democratic Services)
Julia Hedger	Group Manager (Strategic Housing)
Chris Taylor	Group Manager (Strategic Planning and Regeneration)
Fiona Williamson	Group Manager (Property and Place)
Pat Duff	Member Support Officer
Aaron Keyte	Accountant (Housing and Regeneration)
Vicki Nash	Home Energy Conservation Officer
Becky Oblein	Team Leader (Strategic Planning and Regeneration)
Katie Warner	Customer Insight Officer

The meeting began at 7.35 pm.

CA/103/12 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2012 were agreed by the members present and signed by the Chairman.

CA/104/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

CA/105/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Williams declared a personal interest in agenda item 16 (minute CA/118/12), Capital Strategy Steering Group Report Request for Capital Approval (Maylands Business Centre). Councillor Williams is a tenant of the Maylands Business Centre.

CA/106/12 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

CA/107/12 REFERRALS TO CABINET

There were no referrals to Cabinet.

CA/108/12 CABINET FORWARD PLAN

Decision

That the Cabinet Forward Plan be noted, subject to the following amendment:

11 December 2012

Grovehill Neighbourhood Plan – new item.

CA/109/12 AUTHORISATION OF VIREMENTS

Decision

That the virements from the Service Area as listed below and detailed in the report be noted:

- Performance, Policy and Projects
- Commercial Assets and Property Development
- Strategic Planning and Regeneration
- Partnerships and Citizen Insight/Housing and Regeneration.

Reason for Decision

To secure the approval of virements for the purposes specified in the Forms (A), as appended to the report.

Implications

Financial

The Scheme of Virements is part of the Council's financial management.

Risk Implications

There are no risk implications.

Corporate Objectives

To standardise documentation and authorisation requirements for all virements.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report and advised that provision had been made for these virements in the budgets.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

There was no consultation.

Voting

None.

CA/110/12 DEVELOPMENT OF A CROSS TENURE HOUSING ENERGY STRATEGY

Decision

1. That a strategic approach to delivering energy efficiency measures across all housing tenures, including Council owned, private sector and registered social landlord stock, be approved.
2. That officers explore opportunities to form a partnership with a Green Deal Provider, to offer Green Deal loans and Energy Company Obligation grants, as the preferred delivery model.
3. That a draft cross tenure Housing Energy Strategy be presented to Members at a future meeting.

Reason for Decision

To agree a strategy for delivering energy efficiency measures across all housing tenures.

Implications

There are no direct financial implications relating to this report.

A strategic approach will ensure efficient use of resources by co-ordinating the work carried out by Property and Place and Regulatory Services across all housing tenures. The development of the strategy will provide opportunities for home energy conservation measures to be installed at lower cost for all tenures, through bulk purchasing and making the best use of external funding.

Risk Implications

The intention of this report is to comply with legislation and therefore avoid the risk of non-compliance. (A full risk assessment will accompany the draft cross tenure Housing Energy Strategy).

Corporate Objectives

To produce a robust and sustainable Housing Energy Strategy in line with current best practice and one that provides value for money and most economical use of resources.

To consult with private sector landlords and RSLs with regard to the development of the strategy.

Affordable Housing

To promote tenant involvement in the development of the strategy.

To encourage new affordable homes to be developed in line with code 4 sustainability targets or equivalent.

Safe and Clean Environment

To produce a strategy for implementing energy conservation measures into existing housing, which delivers a high quality, low carbon environment, helping to make homes warmer and healthier.

Building Community Capacity

To work with local communities and partnerships to reduce fuel poverty through implementing energy efficiency measures, using a cost effective, area-based approach across all tenures of housing, (particularly in wards in the lowest quartile of the indices of deprivation and in areas which are off-gas).

To support the local economy through providing employment opportunities for installing energy conservation measures in the Borough.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced the report and said she had nothing further to add.

The Group Manager (Property and Place) said this was a good opportunity for the Council to look at some of the more difficult areas, whole street refurbishment, external wall insulation and maintain the street scape. There had been a soft launch of the Green Deal on 1 October and preferred partnership arrangements were being considered.

In answer to a question from the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability, the Group Manager (Property and Place) confirmed that the Environmental Sustainability Officer had been involved with the strategy. Working parties had been held involving Planning, Housing and the private sector to ensure a joined up approach.

Options and Why Options Rejected

Option 1 – Green Deal Promoter. This option was rejected as less energy conservation measures would be installed in the Borough.

Option 2 – Green Deal Partner. This was the preferred option. It would enable the Council to attract investment into the Borough and ensure high quality, appropriate energy conservation measures are installed in residents' homes.

Option 3 – Green Deal Provider. This option was rejected as it would be outside of the Council's core business and would post a significant financial risk.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Councillor Margaret Griffiths, Portfolio Holder for Housing;
Councillor Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services;
Mark Gaynor, Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration);
Sally Marshall, Corporate Director (Finance and Governance);
James Doe, Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration).

Voting

None.

CA/111/12 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND PREFERRED MODEL FOR THE DELIVERY OF THE HOUSING REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENTS

Decision

1. That the approach to procurement, as set out in the report and accompanying appendices be agreed.
2. That the timetable for procurement be agreed.
3. That the preferred option for delivery – Option 1A – be agreed.
4. That the internal and external resourcing provisions for the project be agreed:
 - Interim manager to backfill Group Manager (Property and Place)
 - Additional procurement resource
 - External consultants.
5. That authority be delegated to the Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration) and Assistant Director (Housing Landlord), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources, to agree final documentation for the procurement process and any minor variations to the process that may be required

Reason for Decision

To agree a preferred option for delivery of the housing repairs, maintenance and improvements.

Implications

The impact and financial implications of each model have been considered, with assessments regarding any economies of scale that could be derived from each model and the financial costs associated with the procurement activity. The main consideration during the options appraisal has been to consider the financial risks associated with each of the various models of delivery and obtain information from contractors and peer groups as to the preferred and most effective method of financial reimbursement and cost control mechanisms.

The consultancy costs have been allowed for within the 2012-13 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget and are included in the forward business plan. The additional internal support costs will be covered by an under spend on salary for Property and Place.

The Options Appraisal has considered the value for money implications of the various models of delivery.

Risk Implications

The Options Appraisal has included a risk matrix to identify the key areas of risk, which have been weighted to provide an overall assessment of the risks and benefits associated with each model of delivery.

Corporate Objectives

The Options Appraisal has been undertaken to assess the most beneficial model for the delivery of the repairs, maintenance, improvement and new build programme for the housing portfolio to support the Council's corporate objectives and contributes to:

Affordable Housing

To provide a repairs and maintenance service in line with current best practice and one that provides value for money and most economical use of resources.

To promote tenant involvement in deciding type of service preferred.

To provide a repair service that is of a consistent standard regardless of the type of work.

To enable the delivery of new affordable homes.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced the report and said this was a major project. After taking into consideration the consultation, option 1A was the preferred option to be taken forward.

The Group Manager (Property and Place) said further work had been done on the remaining options to explore the risks and benefits of each. Levels of expenditure

were also studied. The Council wanted to be more strategic in the management of the housing stock. The preferred option would provide one contractor to deliver maintenance and repairs and the contractor could help with the stock condition survey. The information they get through the repairs process could supplement held information to help with planned programmes of works.

Gas servicing would be under a separate contract. It was important to have a more direct relationship with the contractor and the model would be changed from servicing to servicing and installation.

The third contract would cover lift servicing and electrical and mechanical installations.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said he was pleased the Council was setting about this in a professional way and asked if it would be an open book relationship with the contractor to enable information to be shared.

The Group Manager (Property and Place) said the financial detail had not yet been determined and depended upon the recommendation made at the meeting. The Council was looking at the potential for a hybrid open book mechanism. The Council would try to ensure that the main contractor used local labour. The benefit of an open book arrangement would give transparency of payment terms of the main and sub contractors.

In answer to a question from the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability, the Group Manager (Property and Place) said the asterisk on page 15 of the report referred to some narrative further explaining the way the contract would be administered. The aim was to have the contract duration spanning the life cycle of the new condensing boilers (10 years) to cover servicing and replacement ones within the 10 year contract.

Options and Why Options Rejected

Option 1A - Multiple Outsourced Contracts – 1 Nr Single Provider for R&M/Planned in one area. This was the preferred option.

Option 1B - Multiple Outsourced Contracts – 2 Nr Single Providers for R&M/Planned in two areas. This option was rejected as the best combination of benefits and risk was Option 1A.

Option 2 - Multiple Outsourced Contracts – Separate contracts for R&M and Planned Works. This option was rejected as the best combination of benefits and risk was Option 1A.

Option 5 – Joint Venture/Subsidiary. This option was rejected as the best combination of benefits and risk was Option 1A.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Councillor Margaret Griffiths, Portfolio Holder for Housing;
Councillor Nicholas Tilley, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources.
Tenant Representatives:
Tenants and Leaseholder Committee.

Procurement Project Board.
Corporate Management Team.
Bevan Brittan, Legal firm specialising in the Public Sector.
Stradia, CIPFA approved Financial and Cost Consultants.

Voting

None.

CA/112/12 MEETING TIMETABLE

Decision

That Council be recommended to approve the Meeting Timetable for 2013/14 as set out in Annex A to the report.

Reason for Decision

To approve the Meeting Timetable for 2013/14.

Implications

Approval of the Meeting Timetable enables members and officers to manage forward decision making planning.

Risk Implications

Not applicable.

Corporate Objectives

The various meetings of the Council, Cabinet and committees support the achievement of the Council's corporate objectives.

Advice

The Leader of the Council introduced the report and had nothing further to add.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with the Leader of the Council and Chief Officers.

Voting

None.

CA/113/12 DACORUM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2012-15

Decision

- 1. That Council be recommended to approve the approach and general content of the Dacorum Economic Development Strategy 2012-2015, together with the Open for Business statement.**
2. That the final detailed version of the Dacorum Economic Development Strategy 2012-2015 for publication be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, in respect of final detailed changes to the Strategy and the development of monitoring indicators.

Reason for Decision

To agree the Economic Development Strategy for 2012-15 and the contents of the Open for Business statement.

Implications

Financial

None as a direct result of this report. Elsewhere on the agenda is the report on the Dacorum Look No Further project which is supported by the new Economic Development Strategy; but is funded by an allocation of £150,000 for two years. Otherwise the initiatives in the new Strategy will be met from established budgets and staffing, and the use of external funding where secured and where appropriate.

Value for Money

The Strategy policy lays out the actions we will focus on in order to maximise Dacorum's potential to maintain and grow the local economy by enabling opportunities to come forward, attracting new inward investment and on continuing and enhancing Business support services. It may provide the platform from which to bid for external funding when available. The plan focuses on the regeneration of the Maylands Business Park and the Town Centre, which are key employment areas for both the borough and the county of Hertfordshire, and encourages a high standard of design and construction to ensure an attractive work place. The plan draws from a number of strategies and plans to give an overall strategy for the borough and its economy.

Risk Implications

A Risk Assessment is included within the Project Initiation Document for this area of work.

Corporate Objectives

The new Economic Development Strategy supports the Council's vision and in particular the corporate objective of regeneration.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report. The Council was planning to employ a Marketing and Tourism Officer for a two year contract, at the end of which the position could be self sustaining.

The Group Manager (Strategic Planning and Regeneration) said the report detailed the new draft strategy but it also contained the public declaration 'Open for Business' asking everyone, including staff, to encourage businesses to invest in the area.

The highlights of the research carried out are included at the back of the Strategy and this was taken in to account and reflected the Cabinet report of November 2011. The Group Manager (Strategic Planning and Regeneration) was happy this would help deliver growth and development. Additional resources had been allocated to this work and it was important to show positive outcomes.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services said he was pleased the Council was recruiting a Marketing and Tourism Officer and would be happy to work with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and the officer to help put Dacorum on the map.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing asked for clarification regarding delegation of the decision.

The Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration) advised that they would be minor changes and suggested it was an officer decision unless the Portfolio Holder for Housing felt otherwise.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) advised that if it was to be a Portfolio Holder decision, the Council would have to give 28 days notice of that decision.

The Leader of the Council said he was happy with the recommendation detailed in the report.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The Maylands Partnership;
The Employment and Skills Group.

Voting

None.

CA/114/12 INWARD INVESTMENT AND DACORUM LOOK NO FURTHER CAMPAIGN UPDATES

Decision

That the approach to attract inward investment into the Borough and the promotion of the Borough more generally, as set out in the report, be endorsed.

Reason for Decision

To endorse an approach to attract inward investment into the Borough.

Implications

Financial

The work within this report is contained within the additional budget allocated by Cabinet in December 2011. The Tourism post will be fixed term for a period of two years though with an aim to become self funding after that time through advertising revenue driven by the new Dacorum Look No Further website, as explained in the report.

Value for Money

The nature of this work in many areas is of a pilot nature. Monitoring and evaluation will enable assessment of which areas show the best returns for the investment and value for money.

Risk Implications

A Risk Assessment is included with the Project Initiation Document for this area of work.

Corporate Objectives

The project supports the corporate vision and in particular the priority of regeneration.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report and said the Dacorum Open for Business Showcase was being held on 9 November 2012 and was an opportunity to spread the word about Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Tring. All available stands at the event had been sold and there would be an opportunity for businesses to participate in a networking session at the end hosted by the MP, Mike Penning, at a cost of £10. The event would promote Dacorum as being a good place to live, work and play. The Council wanted people to locate and relocate here.

The Group Manager (Strategic Planning and Regeneration) said the whole campaign about Dacorum Look No Further was about the place and getting the word Dacorum in peoples' psyche.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with the Maylands Partnership.

Voting

None.

**CA/115/12 HEMEL EVOLUTION: MARLOWES SHOPPING ZONE
IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY – NEXT STEPS**

Decision

1. That progress on implementing the Marlowes Shopping Zone Improvement strategy, and other Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Improvements be noted.
2. That delegated authority is granted to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) to award a consultancy, design and project management contract for the remaining phases of Improvement works in Hemel Hempstead Town Centre, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, in accordance with the Council's procurement governance arrangements.
3. That delegated authority is granted to the Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration) and Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) to award a construction contract for the remaining phases of improvement works in Hemel Hempstead Town Centre, in accordance with the Council's procurement governance arrangements.

Reason for Decision

To enable implementation of the remaining public realm improvement works.

Implications

Financial

There is remaining provision in the Capital Programme for £3 million to implement the rest of the Marlowes Improvement Strategy. This report seeks authority to procure suitable consultancy, project management and construction, installation and works to complete the proposed works, subject to the Council's procurement rules. The cost of this work will be tested through the procurement process, and is expected to be capitalised against the above provision as an essential cost of this capital project.

Once the nature of the improvements has been decided and a phasing strategy produced, the budget will need to be re-profiled to match the planned expenditure.

It is expected that the design consultancy will cost between 10 and 12% of the total works budget.

Value for Money

This will be achieved through the procurement process.

Risk Implications

A risk assessment is included within the Project Initiation Document for this area of work.

Corporate Objectives

The Town Centre Improvement Strategy supports the Council's vision and in particular the corporate objective of regeneration.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report and said it would enable the Council to move forward with the Marlowes Shopping Centre Improvement Strategy. With a budget of £3m it was important to ensure the right procurement procedures were in place.

The Portfolio Holder said this was an important contract of significant value and authority to grant these contracts should be made at the highest Director level and proposed changes to recommendations 2 and 3 to reflect that.

The changes to recommendations 2 and 3 were agreed.

The Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) said the strategy would take the project to the next stage. Initial work had been carried out in the town centre. Because of the value of this contract, the Council needed an appropriate procurement exercise. The proposals would be based on the Marlowes Procurement Strategy. A member briefing event would be held to work out the priorities of the work (lighting, street furniture, re-paving etc.).

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

There was no consultation.

Voting

None.

CA/116/12 MAYLANDS GATEWAY

Decision

1. That the draft Maylands Gateway Development Brief, as shown at Appendix 1 of the report, be noted and that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to make further amendments to the Brief and to then issue it for public consultation.
2. That a planning application for residential development in the area identified as residential between Maylands Avenue, Wood Lane End and Buncefield Lane within the draft updated Development Brief, be submitted.

Reason for Decision

To enable the development of land at the Maylands Gateway to move forward.

Implications

Financial

No direct impact on the General Fund. The costs of the Development Brief and planning application can be met from established budgets for 2012/13. Forwarding funding of £35,000 will be required to meet the costs for submitting a planning application. This cost will be reimbursed to DBC from the Growing Places Fund once this funding is secured. This does represent a risk to DBC and has been highlighted within the risk assessment.

The Development Brief shows potential developments that may be economically viable in the current climate. Additional use of Council owned land and external funding could be considered to aid delivery within the Gateway if there is a shortfall in the ability for the scheme to be delivered.

Value for Money

The brief has been configured to enable a market-led solution to come forward, to minimise the need to use public resources. The Gateway contains a sizeable amount of publicly owned land (DBC and Homes and Communities Agency) which can be deployed to help capture investment and development to the benefit of the local economy. The use of these and other public resources will have to be considered on a business case basis as and when development proposals come forward.

Risk Implications

A risk assessment was completed on 4 September 2012.

Corporate Objectives

The regeneration of Maylands forms a key part of the “Regeneration” & “Dacorum Delivers” corporate objectives.

The update to the Maylands Gateway Development Brief will guide future development to a prime regeneration location within Maylands helping to increase both job and housing growth in the Borough.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report which was an update of the previous policy. It was recognised that the original aspirations regarding office accommodation were not particularly appropriate in the current economic climate. The proposal was to make the area more attractive with a wider mix of employment.

The Portfolio Holder proposed an amendment to recommendation 1 ‘that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to make further amendments to the brief and to then issue it for public consultation’.

The amendments to recommendation 1 were agreed.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) said it was satisfactory to delegate the decision to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) as it was for consultation purposes only at this stage.

The Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) said the brief was based on the long standing masterplan for the Maylands area. This foresaw a high quality regeneration of the Gateway area.

A planning application would need to be submitted by the end of 2012 for the small residential development to secure the funding. It was hoped that would give a kick start to the project. The land involved was in the ownership of the Homes and Community Agency.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The Maylands Partnership;
Hertfordshire County Council;
Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

Voting

None.

CA/117/12 LOCALISM ACT – COMMUNITY RIGHT TO CHALLENGE AND COMMUNITY RIGHT TO BID

Decision

1. That the requirement for the Council to put in place processes to; (a) respond to any expressions of interest received under the community right to challenge and, (b) administer the list of assets of community value in relation to the community right to bid, be noted.
2. That the document 'Community Right to Challenge – Guidance & Procedure' appended to the report be approved as the Council's process for responding to expressions of interest submitted by relevant bodies under the community right to challenge provisions in the Localism Act.

Reason for Decision

To put in processes to deal with the community right to challenge and the community right to bid.

Implications

Financial

The right to challenge could have significant financial implications for the Council. Depending on the number of expressions of interests that the Council receives, a large amount of officer time could be devoted to processing and assessing expressions of interest and administering procurement exercises.

Value for Money

Where an expression of interest results in a procurement exercise the Council would need to give due consideration to achieving Best Value when making decisions on future delivery.

Risk Implications

Under the Localism Act the Council is under a legal requirement to have in place guidance and procedures for dealing with expressions of interest in providing Council services submitted under the community right to challenge provisions in the Act.

Corporate Objectives

Building Community Capacity – having in place a process which responds constructively to expressions of interest submitted to the Council under the community right to challenge is compatible with the aims of supporting social enterprise and empowering local community action and delivery.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services introduced the report and said this was the draft guidance and procedures on community right to challenge and to put process in place on the community right to bid.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) said the report detailed the new community rights introduced by the Localism Act.

The community right to challenge is concerned with allowing community and voluntary bodies to express an interest in running a service that was currently being run by the Council either by their own in house staff or by an external provider.

The community right to bid was concerned with giving the power to local community groups to prepare and submit a bid to purchase assets such as buildings and land that they felt were of community value.

The report concentrated on the community right to challenge as this had to be in place as soon as possible. Whilst drafting the report, the regulations were published about the community right to bid and more detailed guidance had now been published. Members were asked to focus on the community right to challenge and consider the draft procedure.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing said a lot of members had attended the recent training which had been very useful and had answered a lot of questions.

The Leader of the Council agreed and gave credit to the trainer who had made it an interactive process. There would be challenges ahead, especially on the assets list.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) referred to compensation (paragraph 18 of the report) and gave reassurance to members that, in the recently published Government guidance the Government had indicated they would meet the costs of compensation payments over and above £20k in any financial year. This could be made up of a combined total on a number of smaller claims.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The Corporate Localism working Group;
The Corporate Management Team.

Voting

None.

CA/118/12 CAPITAL STRATEGY STEERING GROUP REPORT ON REQUEST FOR CAPITAL APPROVAL

Decision

1. That Council be recommended to approve that the Capital programme is updated to include the following schemes detailed within the report.

9 High Street Tring – Structural Works and Professional Fees £25,000

Multi Storey Car Park, Berkhamsted – Phase 1 Due Diligence £120,000

39 The Marlowes £335,000

Queen Street Depot £15,000

Voltage Optimisation Units £38,000

**Planning Software Replacement
(funded from Earmarked Reserve) £130,000**

2. That Council be recommended to approve that £130k is drawn down from the Planning and Regeneration Project Implementation Reserve as an in-year supplementary estimate. And that this then forms an in-year revenue contribution to capital in order to finance the Planning Software Replacement project.

3. That the following scheme, already within the approved Capital Programme, be authorised:

**Maylands Business Centre
(funded from EEDA Funding) £32,969**

Reason for Decision

To approve capital provisions within the Capital Programme 2011/12 – 2016/17. This Capital Programme was approved by Council on 29 February 2012.

Implications

The proposal was in line with the budget and financial projections.

Risk Implications

None.

Corporate Objectives

Capital investment was important to the achievement of the Council's objectives.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report. The Portfolio Holder believed the CSSG felt there was an important need for the due diligence examination to go ahead regarding the multi storey car park in Berkhamsted.

Regarding 39 The Marlowes, the Council had purchased 41 The Marlowes at a recent auction and the two buildings would be integrated for the decanting process. It would give the Council the added bonus of controlling the whole site for eventual disposal.

Regarding planning software replacement, there was a need to make these changes to upgrade the service for customers and to improve productivity.

Regarding the Maylands Business Centre, improvements to security were required as recommended by the Crime Prevention Officer. This was covered by funding from EEDA).

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability said the Queen Street did cause problems and welcomed an investigation into the possibility of moving it to a different site.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with the Capital Strategy Steering Group.

Voting

None.

CA/119/12 UPDATE ON COUNCIL HOME NEW BUILD PROGRAMME – PHASE 1

Decision

1. That Council funding for the 1st phase of the Council home new build programme be approved for a total 71 new homes and a new homeless hostel (min 33 bed spaces).

2. That the development proposals for building 9x 2bed flats on the St Peters Church site, Galley Hill (part funded by the HCA programme of 45 new homes including £135k HCA grant) be approved.
3. That the development proposals for building up to 36 new Council homes at 183a London Road, Apsley (part funded by the HCA programme of 45 new homes including £540k HCA grant) be approved.
4. That the development proposals to build 26 new Council homes on the Farm Place site, Berkhamsted as part of the 1st phase of the new build programme be approved.
5. That the development proposals for building a new homeless hostel (minimum 33 bedspaces) at The Elms, Redbourn Road, Hemel Hempstead, part funded by £841k HCA grant be approved.
6. **That Council be recommended to approve land appropriation from the general fund to the HRA for London Road, Apsley – subject to site valuation (approx £1.2m).**
7. That authority be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Housing, in Consultation with the Corporate Directors of Housing and Regeneration and Finance and Governance, to approve the payment of costs to Aldwyck Housing Group to date relating to the current Intellectual Property rights for Farm Place.
8. That authority be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Housing, in consultation with the Corporate Directors of Housing and Regeneration and Finance and Governance, to approve the procurement option for development at Farm Place, The Elms and London Road. (Galley Hill is exempt from this due to the Passiv House design – further detail in the site update below).
9. That an exceptions certificate be granted to appoint Chambers Goodwin Partners as the architect for the St Peters, Galley Hill development. (This is required because the total architect's fee exceeds the £25k approved level as part of the Councils current procurement strategy).
10. That authority be delegated to the Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration) to agree the terms of any infrastructure agreements (including S.106 agreements and S.278 agreements) required in order to bring the developments forward.

Reason for Decision

To enable the development programme to commence.

Implications

Financial

A detailed breakdown of estimated costs per scheme is included in part 2 of this report. This information is commercially sensitive and would jeopardise the required procurement process if available in the public domain at the current time.

See S151 comments for key financial implications.

Value for Money

This will be confirmed through a successful procurement programme.

Risk Implications

The risk assessment was reviewed in October 2012. Individual risks are outlined in the site updates.

Corporate Objectives

Affordable housing.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced the report and said this was a proposal to start building new Council homes in Dacorum, a subject Dacorum Borough Council had not discussed for a number of years. Detailed costings were in an appendix to the report in Part 2 of the agenda.

The various locations were listed in the report. Some were for general housing, The Elms, Redbourn Road was to be a hostel to be run in partnership. More information would be coming forward on that.

The Assistant Director (Housing Landlord) said the report gave updates on each scheme. A similar approach to that used for the housing maintenance procurement would be used and an officer would be seconded to work on it full time. There would be a Project Group that would include representatives from Legal, Procurement and Finance from the beginning so that any advice and decisions could be made fully informed. Consultants would be used if needed for expertise.

The Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration) said the Council would learn from any outside help to accumulate knowledge to enable the Council to move forward.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) advised that recommendation 6 should be referred to Council.

This was agreed.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration was pleased to see the proposal regarding Galley Hill in Gadebridge as it would see a conclusion to the decline of St Peter's Church. As part of this development was to be to Passiv House level 5, this would become a flag ship to demonstrate the Council's commitment to energy efficiency.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Mark Gaynor, Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration)
Elliott Brooks, Assistant Director (Housing Landlord)

James Deane, Group Manager (Financial Services)
Ben Hosier, Group Manager (Commissioning, Procurement & Compliance)
Camellia Smith, Development Lead Officer
Mike Evans, Group Manager (Commercial Assets & Property Development).

Voting

None.

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm.