

MINUTES

CABINET

24 APRIL 2012

Present:

Members:

Councillors:

Brian Ayling	Portfolio Holder for Service and Performance Improvement
Julie Laws	Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability
Margaret Griffiths	Portfolio Holder for Housing
Stephen Holmes	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration
Nick Tiley	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources
Andrew Williams (Chairman)	Leader of the Council
Neil Harden	Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services

Officers:

Daniel Zammit	Chief Executive
Mark Gaynor	Corporate Director (Housing and Regeneration)
Sally Marshall	Corporate Director (Finance and Governance)
David Austin	Assistant Director (Neighbourhood Delivery)
Steven Baker	Assistant Director (Legal Democratic and Regulatory)
James Doe	Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration)
Shane Flynn	Assistant Director (Finance and Resources)
Mark Brookes	Group Manager (Legal Governance)
James Deane	Group Manager (Financial Services)
David Gill	Group Manager (Partnership and Citizen Insight)
Madeleine Taggart-Smith	Communications Officer
Pat Duff	Member Support Officer
Natalie Webb	Team Leader (Partnerships, Policy and Innovations)
Laura Wood	Team Leader (Strategic Planning)

The meeting began at 7.30 pm.

CA/031/12 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 2011 were agreed by the members present and signed by the Chairman.

CA/032/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

CA/033/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

CA/034/12 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

CA/035/12 REFERRALS TO CABINET

There were no referrals to Cabinet.

CA/036/12 CABINET FOUR MONTH WORK PROGRAMME

Decision

That the Cabinet Four-Month Work Programme be noted, subject to the following amendments:

29 May 2012

1. The Provisional Financial Outturn and Closure of Accounts report to follow the Performance and Budget Monitoring Quarterly Report – Quarter 4 report on the agenda.

24 July 2012

2. Member Development Charter Plus Status – report to be removed.

CA/037/12 THE LOCALISM ACT 2011 – CHANGES TO THE STANDARDS REGIME

Decision

1. That Council be recommended to adopt the Code of Conduct for Members appended to the agenda.
2. That Council be recommended to approve that the composition of the Standards Committee should be as detailed in Option 3 in the report:

That the political proportionality rules should be disapplied.

Number of Members:

**5 elected Members of the Borough Council
2 Co-opted Independent Members with no voting rights
2 Co-opted Town/Parish Councillors with no voting rights**

Decisions 1 and 2, if approved by Council, will come into effect from the date that the Government bring into force the new arrangements for standards contained in the Localism Act 2011 (this is expected to be on 1 July 2012). Until the new arrangements come into force the existing Code of Conduct and Standards Committee will remain in place.

Reason for Decision

To recommend that Council approve the Code of Conduct for Members and the composition of the Standards Committee.

Implications

Financial

There are financial and efficiency costs to the Council in having to deal with complaints made under the Code of Conduct. In addition there may be a cost arising from the requirement to appoint Independent Persons as such persons will be entitled to receive an allowance and expenses.

Value for Money

There are value for money benefits to the Council in striving to ensure that complaints against Members are minimised as far as possible and any complaints that are received are dealt with as cost effectively as possible.

Risk Implications

There are no risk implications.

Corporate Objectives

To standardise documentation and authorisation requirements for all virements.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services introduced the report and said the first draft considered by Cabinet in February had raised issues regarding the role and make up of the Standards Committee.

The report detailed three options and the Portfolio Holder favoured Option 3 – political proportionality disapplied – with co-optees.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) stressed that it was a legal requirement for the Council to adopt a Code of Conduct, although the content was at the Council's discretion. The draft Code of Conduct appended to the report was based on the current Code.

Under the existing Code of Conduct, a member with a pecuniary interest was required to withdraw from the meeting room when the matter was discussed. Under the new regime, this was optional and in the draft Code of Conduct this had been disposed with. The new requirement was that a member would stand down while the item was discussed and sit with the public and then return to his/her seat in the committee.

Regarding membership of the Standards Committee, the Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services had indicated that he favoured 5 Borough Council members and 4 co-opted members comprising of 2 Parish/Town Councillors and 2 independent members. The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) endorsed that.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said he endorsed the recommendation and would be happy to get rid of the political aspect. The Portfolio Holder also endorsed the draft Code of Conduct appended to the report, including the

standing down arrangements for members who declared disclosable pecuniary interests.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing agreed with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources. Having devised the Standing Orders, it would not be right to change them completely.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability asked if the Council could expect the Town and Parish Councils to use the Code of Conduct within their Councils and abide by any decisions made by the Standards Committee if their members had no voting rights on the committee.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) advised that at the moment the Town and Parish Councils would not be bound by any decisions taken by the Standards Committee. At a recent meeting with Parish Clerks it seemed the majority of Parish Councils would resolve to be bound by the decisions of the Standards Committee, although there were some exceptions.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing asked if each Parish/Town Council could be asked, on a voluntary basis, to give feedback if they will or will not abide by the Code by making it an official item on their agendas.

Once that information was known the Portfolio Holder suggested that the Parish/Town Council co-opted members of the Standards Committee should be selected only from those Parish/Town Councils bound to abide by the Code of Conduct.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) suggested that, once this had been resolved, the Council should approach the Town and Parish Clerks, Parish Chairmen and Chairwomen and make it clear that the Council was asking them to take part in this process. For those who chose not to abide by the Code of Conduct, the Council would not partake in dealing with complaints about those Parish/Town Councils.

Regarding the composition of the Standards Committee, the Leader of the Council said he was happy with the suggestions made. There would need to be further clarification about the Parish/Town Councils participating in the process. Page 6 of the report said the Council was required to have in place arrangements for the handling of complaints about parish and town councillors. If Parish/Town Councils opted out of the process, was that sufficient reason for the Council not to have to deal with their complaints? The Council needed to know it had fully fulfilled its duties under the Act and know that the particular Town and Parish Councils were aware that the Council would not be acting for them.

The Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic and Regulatory) said the position would have to be clarified.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

There was no consultation.

Voting

None.

CA/038/12 SPORTS POLICY STATEMENT AND SPORTS FACILITIES AUDIT

Decision

1. That the Sports Policy Statement be approved.
2. That the Sports Facilities Audit be adopted.
3. That the Sports Facilities Audit and options contained within it, (as outlined in Paragraph 5 of the report) form the basis for consideration of future development for sports facilities across the Borough.

Reason for Decision

To approve the Sports Policy Statement and Dacorum Borough Council's approach to sport and sports facilities.

Implications

Financial

There are no specific financial implications relating to this report

Value for Money

By working with partner organisations and showing DBC's commitment to sport the Council is supporting the delivery of such services to our community. The Council's endorsement is vital in building partnerships and empowering and enabling others.

By considering the provision of sport facilities in the Borough we are able to focus improvements to those facilities which most require funds.

Risk Implications

Commitment to sport and sports facilities across the Borough recognises its contribution to the health and wellbeing of our community and the impact that sport has on community cohesion. Without a Sports Policy Statement there is a risk to the Council's reputation, particularly amongst sport deliverers and interest groups.

Corporate Objectives

This report links to the following objectives:

Dacorum Delivers
Building Community Capacity
Regeneration
Safe and Clean Environment.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services introduced the report. The Sports Facilities Audit was a consultation regarding sports buildings and facilities that Dacorum Borough Council maintained and on how they would be maintained and

improved over the coming years. The drawing up of the Sports Policy Statement involved a lot of consultation which gave the Council a good opportunity to meet with different sport representatives. The Sports Policy Statement covered the vision and priorities of the Council.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

External:

John O'Callaghan, Hertfordshire Sports Network, Club, Coach and Sports Development Officer
Andy Criddle, Dacorum Sports Network, Chair
Tom May, NHS Hertfordshire, Health Improvement Advanced Practitioner
Clare McCawley, Dacorum School Sports Network, Dacorum School Sports Manager
Ed Sandham, Sport England, Local Government Relationship Manager
Dave Cove, CEO Sportspace- Dacorum Sports Trust
Rebecca Dukes, Sportspace- Dacorum Sports Trust, Sports Development Manager
Amanda Colwill, Sportspace- Dacorum Sports Trust, Business Development Manager
Brian Worrell, Dacorum Cultural Forum, Chair
Brian Doran, Dacorum Festival of Culture, Chair

Internal:

Claire Covington, Parks and Open Spaces Manager
Heather Overhead, Planning Officer
Katy D'Souza, Outdoor Recreation Officer
Joe Guiton, Team Leader, Neighbourhood Action
Julie Still, Group Manager, Residents Services
Gill Barber, Dacorum 2012 Officer
David Gill, Group Manager, Partnerships and Citizen Insight
Cllr Neil Harden, Portfolio Holder Residents and Regulatory Services
CMT

Sports Facilities Audit Steering Group:

Dacorum Borough Council
Dacorum Sports Trust
Sport England
Genesis Consultancy
Hertfordshire County Council
Hertfordshire Sports Partnership
PCT
Dacorum Sports Network
Dacorum Schools Sports Partnership

Voting

None.

CA/039/12 SUBMISSION OF CORE STRATEGY

Decision

1. That the significant new issues arising from representations received to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy and the impact of new advice be noted.
2. **That Council be recommended to approved that:**
 - (a) **no significant changes are made to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy as a result of representations received; and**
 - (b) **the Submission documents are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.**
3. That authority be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to approve any further minor wording changes to the Core Strategy prior to consideration by Full Council.
4. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) to:
 - (a) Finalise the Report of Representations and other Submission documents; and
 - (b) Agree any further minor changes arising during the course of the Examination.

Reason for Decision

To agree the process for submitting the Core Strategy to the Planning Inspectorate, taking into consideration the significant new issues raised through representations on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy in late 2011.

Implications

Financial

The process of preparing the Core Strategy, and wider Local Planning Framework (LPF), has financial implications. Cabinet considered the implications of a three year budget programme in November 2009. Budget provision, together with a reserve, is made for 2012/13.

Having an up-to-date planning framework helps reduce the incidence of planning appeals (and hence costs associated with these). It will be the most effective way of ensuring the optimum level of developer contributions to infrastructure and in mitigation of development impacts can be achieved. This process will be further improved and simplified through the adoption of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) approach.

Value for money

Where possible, technical work that supports the Core Strategy has been jointly commissioned with adjoining authorities to ensure value for money.

Legal

Jameson and Hill have been appointed to provide external legal support for the Core Strategy. They will provide the Council with any advice required regarding the implication of new Government advice; assist with responding to key representations;

advise on the production of any additional evidence and support Officers through the Examination process itself.

Human Resources

It is critical that the Strategic Planning and Regeneration team are fully staffed to enable the agreed LPF timetable to be delivered. An experienced Programme Officer has been appointed by the Council to provide administrative support to the Inspector and act as a single, independent point of contact for all parties throughout the Examination process.

Land

The Core Strategy will play an important role in decisions regarding future land uses within the Borough. The Council has specific land ownership interest in two of the Local Allocations - LA1 (Marchmont Farm) and LA2 (Old Town).

Risk Implications

Key risks are identified in the Local Development Scheme and reviewed annually with the Annual Monitoring Report. They include failure of external agencies or consultants to deliver on time, changes in Government policy and team capacity. A separate risk assessment prepared for the Core Strategy Pre-Submission identifies a number of risks relating to the Examination process and particularly the soundness tests with which the Core Strategy must comply.

Corporate Objectives

Preparation (and delivery) of the Core Strategy and other components of the Local Planning Framework contributes to all the corporate objectives. The aim is to achieve high quality, sustainable development in the right place, at the right time and with the right infrastructure, whilst also recognising the need to protect green space.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report which was a culmination of Task and Finish Groups and various consultations. Whilst there were a number of objections relating to the level of housing, developers found the targets too low and local residents found them too high.

The Local Allocations which were green belt housings would be managed as countryside until being required for housing. This would push the requirement to use green belt back in the plan and, therefore, would prioritise the brown field and other windfall sites to be used first.

The new Duty to Co-operate contained within the Localism Act had allowed the Council to comment on and receive comments from neighbouring councils and to open informal dialogue on cross boundary work. There were no major issues raised through the omissions consultation.

With the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in March, there could be some small amendments required to keep the Core Strategy in line with the new legislation. It was proposed that any changes required should be agreed under delegation to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration.

Provided there were no significant changes proposed by full Council which would require further consultation, it was proposed to submit the Core Strategy to the Planning Inspectorate by the end of May.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) said that, with regard to the new National Planning Policy Framework, the timing of the Core Strategy was significant. Any minor changes would be built in.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services asked for confirmation that the Council would always have planning policy guidance in place to deal with any challenges raised at the Development Control Committees.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) said that the National Planning Policy Framework would not do everything. A key feature was that it delegated down to local level. The Council was in a strong position when it came to these matters.

The Leader of the Council said the National Planning Policy Framework had come into effect on 28 March but the existing Development Framework would stay in place for a further 12 months. The Leader of the Council expressed concern that the National Planning Policy Framework was a framework for developers around the countryside and would not offer the protection the Council would seek to have in Dacorum. The Leader of the Council wanted to be confident about protecting development in the area.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) said it would be good if the Council could show it had a robust plan. The key issue that would be the subject of the public examination would be the level of housing supply. The Council must demonstrate there was adequate housing supply. The Council had taken advice and the indication was that the Council had that robust supply.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability asked how interested parties could be heard at the inspection hearing.

The Team Leader, Strategic Planning and Regeneration, advised that the Programme Leader would circulate an agenda to all parties who had expressed an interest. If a person's name had not featured on that list, that person could request a seat. It was at the Inspector's discretion if a person could participate.

The Leader of the Council said that recommendation 2 of the report was to make recommendations to full Council. A special meeting of the Council was required to consider item 11 on the Cabinet agenda, Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Regeneration. The Leader of the Council suggested the special meeting of the Council be held on Tuesday 22 May and that the Submission of the Core Strategy also be considered at that meeting.

This was agreed.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

The report refers to consultation undertaken on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. The results of this will be summarised in the Report of Representations that will be

submitted to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Core Strategy. The results of all previous consultation are summarised in the Report of Consultation that accompanied the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. Volume 7 provides an overview. Development Plans Task and Finish Group were consulted at regular intervals during the preparation of the Core Strategy. The Local Strategic Partnership Board also discussed the content of the Core Strategy at key stages in its production. Corporate Management Team has been appraised of progress and have expressed support for the recommendations set out in this report.

Voting

None.

CA/040/12 OLD TOWN HALL

Decision

1. That the Phase 1 Capital Improvements to the Old Town Hall (2012 / 2013) be approved.
2. That the Phase 2 Capital Improvements to the Old Town Hall are delayed until the further development of wider Economic Regeneration Strategy of the Old Town which is part of the Old Town renaissance project.

Reason for Decision

To approve Capital Improvements to the Old Town Hall.

Implications

Financial

There is £700,000 in the Council's Capital programme (2012/2013) for this project.

When the Cellar Club is reopened it will host comedy nights, jazz, rock and indie music nights as well as being available for private hire. This will bring a ticket sale income of approximately £10,000 per annum which will offset the additional staffing support required.

Value for Money

This investment will improve the 'offer' of the Old Town Hall and contribute towards the wider regeneration of Hemel Hempstead Old Town.

Risk Implications

Risk Assessment had been carried out as part of the Project Initiation Document.

Corporate Objectives

Regeneration.
Dacorum Delivers.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services introduced the report and said this was the Council's commitment to the arts community. The funding would pay for a lift and would open up the cellar for the use of comedians and artists.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing said she would be delighted to see that area open up again. This was a facility that the town needed and had not been able to use.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration said this scheme fitted in well with the Renaissance Project in the Old Town and expressed the hope that the area would also become a tourist area.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Julie Still, Group Manager (Resident Services)
Sara Railson, Manager of the Old Town Hall
Dacorum Cultural Forum.

Voting

None.

CA/041/12 HEMEL HEMPSTEAD TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION – NEXT STEPS FOR GADE ZONE AND PUBLIC SERVICE QUARTER

Decision

1. That the draft policy statement for the Gade Zone set out in the report (at Appendix 1) be approved and be incorporated into the Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan.
2. That the approach for a development of the Civic Centre and College sites to deliver a regeneration of new food store and associated facilities and a new College building, as outlined in the report, is endorsed.
3. That the preferred location for the new Public Service Quarter building be in the Marlowes/Library area, and that, should for any reason it become impractical to implement this preference, the reserve option is taken forward.
4. That arrangements for public exhibitions and consultation on the Hemel Evolution proposals as set out in the report are noted.
5. That the timetable for the project as set out in section 5.5 of the report be agreed.

Reason for Decision

To endorse the proposals for regeneration of the Gade Zone in the light of collaboration and negotiation with key partners and approve amendments to the project moving forward, to identify the preferred location for the Public Service Quarter and to consider the planning statement for the Gade Zone which will be part of the Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan.

Implications

Financial

Provision has been made in the budget for 2012/13 of £425,000 for professional, legal and consultancy support for the Public Service Quarter delivery. All other details are dealt with in the Part 2 report.

Value for Money

Town Centre Masterplan – production in house using establishment officer resource and selective use of expert consultancy input only where necessary.

Public Service Quarter – the future of the Civic Centre has been thoroughly assessed and, on assumptions made at the time, there is a business case to support its physical replacement with a new Public Service Quarter (PSQ) as more cost-effective than the business as usual/status quo option. New construction relating to the Council's own occupational requirements will be funded as much as possible through sale of DBC assets thereby minimising the take from capital reserves.

Operation of a new fit for purpose PSQ based on latest energy efficiency construction and new ways of working is estimated to deliver a considerable saving on running costs.

Risk Implications

A risk assessment has been carried out for the Dacorum Local Planning Framework Core Strategy and the initial Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan project initiation document.

A separate risk assessment relating to the delivery of the PSQ was prepared for Cabinet in November 2011. This has been updated.

Corporate Objectives

The project to regenerate Hemel Hempstead Town Centre has been identified as a top priority for the Council. Because of its multi faceted nature, and proposals to deliver a new public service quarter, it contributes to all five of the Council's corporate objectives.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report. There had been collaboration with West Herts College. An opportunity has arisen to develop the northern part of the Gade Zone in collaboration with Morrison supermarkets and West Herts College. This would involve vacating the Civic Centre site to allow development of a medium-sized supermarket and new college to the north.

The recommendation was to amend the Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Master Plan to incorporate the new proposals and endorse the approach.

There had been consultation with numerous stakeholders which indicated two potential sites. The report set out the two options, the option not chosen would become the reserve site. There were advantages to the Marlowes/Library site over the Water Gardens and this was the recommendation.

It was proposed to hold public consultations on 3 and 5 May in the town centre.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing said it was wonderful to see this project going forward again. It had been the Council's desire to generate this part of the town and the Portfolio Holder hoped it would get support when it was referred to full Council.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources endorsed those comments. It was an exciting opportunity and one that he was in favour of.

The Leader of the Council said it had taken a period of time to reassess the situation. The suggestion here was to work with two very keen partners. It was a good opportunity to see a significant new college built in Hemel Hempstead and was to be welcomed. It would present a very positive intent of the Council's to regenerate Hemel Hempstead and would encourage others to join in with this process. The Council had the enthusiasm to share facilities and upgrade the assets of other public service partners. This was a very welcome step in the right direction and the Leader of the Council was happy to support the recommendation. This part of the decision did not need to be referred to full Council. The referral of the Part 2 report would go to full Council on 22 May.

Regarding recommendation 3 of the report, the Leader of the Council said that attempting to develop in the car park and water garden area at the same time as working with other organisations to bid for funding to regenerate the water garden area would not be the best option. For this reason the preferred location for the new Public Service Quarter was the Marlowes/Library site.

Options and Why Options Rejected

Marlowes/Library site – this was the chosen site.

Water Gardens car park – this site was rejected as it was more risky, time consuming and expensive.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Corporate Management Team
Chris Taylor, Group Manager, Development Management and Planning
Mike Evans, Group Manager, Commercial Property and Assets
Ben Hosier, Group Manager, Procurement [check]
James Deane, Group Manager, [input]
Nathalie Webb, [input]

Voting

None.

CA/042/12 ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

Decision

That Council be recommended to approve:

- 1. The Strategic Asset Management Plan.**
- 2. The proposed work programme set out in the report.**

Reason for Decision

To approve revisions to the existing asset management plans and to approve a new strategy for driving value from the Council's assets.

Implications

Financial

The Council currently spends approximately £3.0m p.a. on premises. Income derived from commercial lettings amounts to £3.3m per annum.

Capital resources set aside within the capital programme for property acquisitions include £1.110k in 2011/12 and £700k in 2012/13. Anticipated capital receipts from sales of properties (including Housing under the Right to Buy scheme) amount to a budgeted £1.5m p.a.

Decisions regarding the acquisition, development and disposal of assets can therefore have a significant impact on capital and revenue budgets.

Value for Money

Maintaining assets to support the delivery of council services is essential, as is acquiring new ones to support changes and disposing of existing ones that are no longer fit for purpose. The consideration of 'fit for purpose' incorporates a decision over value for money and each decision regarding the utilisation of assets needs to take value for money into account.

Risk Implications

Individual Risk Assessments are completed for each development, acquisition or disposal decision in relation to Council assets. Risk Registers supporting Directorate Service Plans incorporate risks governing the use of property and Health and Safety risks which form part of the preparation of the Strategic Asset Management Plan

Corporate Objectives

Management of the Council's assets supports the achievement of the Council's vision and all five of its priorities. In particular the proposals and programmes set out in the Strategic Asset Management Plan support the Regeneration Priority under the heading 'Drive Value from Council-owned Assets'.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report.

The Assistant Director (Finance and Resources) said the purpose of the report was to provide the strategic context.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The Corporate Management Team
The Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Voting

None.

CA/043/12 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AMENDMENTS

Decision

1. That Council be recommended to approve the following amendments to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy (in the case of point 2, subject to approval of participation in the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme):
 - i. that the maximum investment limit for each institution rated 'blue' under the Sector creditworthiness scheme be raised from £10m to £12.5m;
 - ii. that a cash-backed guarantee in support of the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme is permitted to be invested in a participating institution for a maximum period of 7 years.
2. That Council be recommended to approve 'cash-backed' participation in the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme, in tandem with Hertfordshire County Council.

Reason for Decision

To approve amendments to the Council's Treasury Management Strategy.

Implications

Financial

The Council's return on investment provides a revenue stream and should be optimised within the context of the Council's risk appetite.

Value for Money

See above.

Risk Implications

Increasing investment in specific types of institution increases the risk of financial loss in the event of default by institutions within that category. This risk applies to all financial investments and is mitigated by spreading the risk across a range of institutions.

Under current arrangements the advice by our financial adviser Sector is that investment is limited to the least risk categories (as defined by the Sector colour scheme). Increasing the threshold for investment in institutions within these groups, therefore represents a lower risk option than seeking higher returns at institutions outside of the schemes recommended by Sector. The risk can be further mitigated by spreading investments across the range of institutions within the group.

Corporate Objectives

None.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report. The recommendation to full Council was to increase the limit for the Council's counterparties rated in the highest 'blue' category to £12.5m. The Corporate Director (Finance and Governance) had spoken to the auditors who said they were comfortable with the decision and that the Council invest in the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme, in tandem with Hertfordshire County Council. This would encourage first time home ownership in the borough.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing said it would be a missed opportunity for first time buyers in Dacorum if the Council did not participate in this scheme.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration said first time ownership was very important and it would help people get on the first rung of the ladder.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Hertfordshire County Council
Sector Treasury Services.

Voting

None.

CA/044/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Decision

That, under s.100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12A Part 1, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the

public be excluded during the items in Part II of the Agenda for the meeting, because it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that, if members of the public were present during those items, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information relating to:

1. The financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Minute CA/045/12.

2. The financial and business affairs of the Council and third party company/organisation.

Minute CA/046/12.

CA/045/12 WRITE OFF OF LOAN DEBTOR BALANCE

Decision

That the recommendation detailed in the report be approved.

Full details are in the Part 2 minute.

Reason for Decision

To approve write off of an irrecoverable debt in line with the Financial Regulations.

Implications

Full details are in the Part 2 minute.

Risk Implications

There were no risk implications.

Corporate Objectives

Not applicable.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report.

Full details are in the Part 2 minute.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

There were no consultees.

Voting

None.

CA/046/12 HEMEL HEMPSTEAD TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION – PHASE 1 PROPOSALS AND NEW PUBLIC SERVICE QUARTER

Decision

That the recommendation as detailed in the report be approved.

Full details are in the Part 2 minute.

Reason for Decision

To approve the proposals for the first major phase of regeneration proposals for Hemel Hempstead.

Implications

Full details are in the Part 2 minute.

Risk Implications

A risk assessment has been carried out for the Dacorum Local Planning Framework Core Strategy and the initial Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan project initiation document.

Corporate Objectives

The project to regenerate Hemel Hempstead Town Centre has been identified as a top priority for the Council. Because of its multi faceted nature, and proposals to deliver a new public service quarter, it contributes to all five of the Council's corporate objectives.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report.

Full details are in the Part 2 minute.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Corporate Management Team
Chris Taylor, Group Manager, Development Management and Planning
Mike Evans, Group Manager, Commercial Property and Assets
Ben Hosier, Group Manager, Procurement [check]
James Deane, Group Manager, [input]
Nathalie Webb, [input]

Voting

None.

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm.