

MINUTES

CABINET

24 JUNE 2014

Present:

Members:

Councillors:

Margaret Griffiths	Portfolio Holder for Housing
Neil Harden	Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services
Julie Laws	Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability
Andrew Williams (Chairman)	Leader of the Council/Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Officers:

Sally Marshall	Chief Executive
Martin Hone	Corporate Director (Finance and Operations)
James Doe	Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration)
Mark Brookes	Group Manager (Legal Governance)
Jim Doyle	Group Manager (Democratic Services)
Ben Hosier	Group Manager (Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance)
Julia Hedger	Group Manager (Strategic Housing)
Chris Troy	Group Manager (Regulatory Services)
Chris Baker	Revenues and Benefits Support Manager
Sarah Churchyard	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Officer
Luisa Clarke	Team Leader (Communications and Consultation)
Jo Deacon	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Officer
Andrew Linden	Procurement Team Leader
Claire Lynch	Community Partnerships Officer
Dawn Rhoden	Regulatory Services Operations Team Leader
Laura Wood	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Team Leader
Pat Duff	Member Support Officer

The meeting began at 7.33 pm.

CA/064/14 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 May 2014 were agreed by the members present and signed by the Chairman.

CA/065/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor N Tiley, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources.

CA/066/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

CA/067/14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

Councillor Guest asked to make a statement regarding agenda item 17, Dacorum Local Planning Framework: Pre-Submission Site Allocations (CA/080/14).

CA/068/14 REFERRALS TO CABINET

Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 4 June 2014

OS/118/14 – Financial Regulations Revision

That the referral be considered with item 13 on the agenda (minute CA/076/14).

CA/069/14 CABINET FORWARD PLAN

Decision

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

24 June 2014

1. Council New Build – Queen Street, Tring – the Leader of the Council agreed this decision could be taken by the Cabinet under the Council's urgency provisions.

22 July 2014

2. Water Gardens – additional report.

CA/070/14 RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT QUARTER 4 2013/14

Decision

That the report be noted.

Reason for Decision

To note the Quarter 4 report on the Strategic Risk Register and to note the Quarter 4 update on the Operational Risk Registers.

Implications

Financial

None identified

Value for Money

Risk management is closely linked to the Council's commitment to ensure that all resources are used efficiently and forms part of effective financial planning. The Council also needs to ensure that adequate provisions are in place to address anticipated risks but that these are no greater than necessary so that maximum resources are applied to services as required. To this end the Council sets minimum target working balances for both the general fund and HRA and at the date of this report these minimum balances are secured. Budget exercises for 2013/14 have ensured that the minimum balance requirements will also be met for the next financial year.

Risk Implications

Effective risk management is an important factor in all policymaking, planning and decision making.

Failure to manage risk effectively could have serious consequences for the Council leading to increased costs, wasted resources, prosecution and criticism under external assessments

Corporate Objectives

Dacorum Delivers – Risk management is an essential part of ensuring that the Council meets all of its objectives

Advice

The Corporate Director Finance and Operations introduced the report which was the fourth quarter report for 2013/14. The report detailed changes in the assessment of risk exposure between the current and previous quarters. Pages 2 and 3 of the report detailed the corporate risks.

An example of movement was F5 – Risk of collapse from chalk mine activity following subsidence at 1 Meadow Road.

An extra risk, R3, had been added at the request of the Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Disclosure of personal data in breach of the Data Protection Act.

Two operational risks had increased:

- PP R11 – The CSGC contractor focuses attention on meeting speed of response targets and not quality of service.
- FR R01 – Council Tax and Business Rates drop below budget.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with the Corporate Management Team and the Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Voting

None.

CA/071/14 CIVIC CENTRE OCCUPATION AND DISPOSAL AND UPDATE ON FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE QUARTER AND GADE ZONE REGENERATION PROCUREMENT

Decision

1. That the Civic Centre site be jointly marketed alongside the College site with the freedom for either party to opt for an individual solution and for this to be on the basis of an open market sale with any decision to be made subject to a future Cabinet report.
2. That the proposed uses and occupation of the Civic Centre, as set out in section 3 of the report, be approved.
3. **That Council be recommended to increase the PSQ budget by £1.75M to take account of the received tender prices, contingency, furnishing, technical support and the impact of continuing build cost inflation.**
4. **That Council be recommended to approve a £200k budget, to be funded from the PSQ reserve, to facilitate the marketing and disposal of the Civic Centre site and delivery of the Gade Zone Regeneration and associated land disposals.**

Reason for Decision

To make recommendations on:

- The disposal of the Civic Centre site and the potential of linking with the college land disposal.
- Making best use of the Civic Centre prior to disposal.
- Budget requirements for the Public Service Quarter (PSQ) following receipt of tenders.

Implications

Financial

The indicative financial implications are set out in the report.

Value for Money

The indicative estimates of the likely running costs of the new PSQ for the Council are that a saving of around £300K per annum resulting from a reduction in space and therefore National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR), from lower energy consumption, and from lower ongoing repair and maintenance costs (the Group Manager Commercial

Assets and property Development has confirmed that these include expensive replacement of heating and ventilation equipment and capital repairs required in the next five years if the Council continued to occupy the Civic Centre of between £2 – 3M). By moving out of the Civic Centre therefore substantial capital investment that would otherwise have been required is avoided.

The Council will ensure that best value is received for the sale by marketing the land on the open market.

Risk Implications

With regard to PSQ and Gade Zone Regeneration a new risk assessment and management plan will be agreed with the successful development partner following selection which will set out key risks and mitigation. A separate internal risk register will be developed alongside this. To date risks have been managed through the projects exiting risk register.

Corporate Objectives

Dacorum Delivers: Maximising the value of Council Assets and providing Value for Money. The use of the Civic Centre will avoid decant costs and consolidation of use of the space will reduce running costs. The PSQ will be a more cost efficient building to operate than the Civic Centre.

Regeneration. The Gade Zone Regeneration project is aimed primarily to deliver significant regeneration in the town centre. It facilitates the creation of a new community focused building housing public sector and voluntary sector partners, a new commercial leisure facility developing more family friendly and evening attractions into the town centre and much needed new homes. Subsequent development of the Civic Centre and college sites will bring further new investment into the town centre, most likely for new housing.

Affordable Housing. New housing created will include affordable housing at 35%.

Safe and Clean Environment. The PSQ will be built to 'BREEAM excellent' standard and the design of all new town centre development will be guided by the Town Centre Masterplan which sets out high sustainability requirements

Advice

The Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration summarised the report which was about the future of the site as a result of Morrisons not proceeding with their development. An increase in the PSQ budget was required to take account of information received from tendering.

The college was keen to progress on their site and this offered the opportunity for the combined asset to be offered as one but there was also the option for each site to proceed independently.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing said she was pleased the Council was moving on after the disappointment of the Morrisons withdrawal. The proposals were very exciting and the Council would deliver on the project.

The Leader of the Council said the Council would need to be in the current Civic Centre until 2017. The college was likely to be able to proceed earlier which could lead to a separate procurement process for the two sites.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The Monitoring Officer;
The S 151 Officer;
James Doe, Assistant Director Planning and Regeneration;
James Deane, Assistant Director Finance and Resource;
Ben Hosier, Group Manager Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance;
Mike Evans, Group Manager Commercial Assets and Property Development;
Mark Brookes, Group Manager Legal Governance.

Voting

None.

CA/072/14 HEMEL EVOLUTION: MARLOWES SHOPPING ZONE AND BANK COURT, BUS INTERCHANGE AND MARKET SQUARE, AND WEATGER GARDENS PROJECTS

Decision

Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court

1. That the revised design for the Marlowes Shopping Zone food court improvements be approved, including the provision of replacement toilet facilities with the option to deliver a ticketing facility for the Bus Interchange.
2. That delegated authority is given to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration), in consultation with Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, to approve further design, planning and implementation decisions on recommendation 1 above.
3. **That Council be recommended to approve £500,000 additional capital budget for the regeneration of Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court.**
4. That the virement of £120,000 from the Bus Interchange budget to the Marlowes Shopping Zone budget be approved to provide replacement toilet facilities and a ticketing facility for the Bus Interchange as part of the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvement works.
5. That the merging of Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court cost centres (BP009 and BP027) be approved as the projects are being delivered as a single project by the same contractor.

Water Gardens

- 6 That the commencement of the Access and Movement Improvement combined project as outlined in this report, with a feasibility study into the works, be approved..
- 7 That the joint delivery of the Access and Movement Improvement Project with the planned capital works to the decked Water Gardens (North) car park be approved.
- 8 That authority be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources to progress improvements to the Water Gardens car park combined project following completion of the feasibility work and development of options.
- 9 That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration and the Assistant Director Finance and Resources to appoint consultants to undertake feasibility work for the combined project and design to RIBA E, with the option of continuing through to delivery.
- 10 That the improvement works be tendered with the procurement of the main contractor for the Water Gardens restoration (subject to the outcome of the Stage 2 bid), provided that this does not impede the delivery of the Water Gardens project.
- 11 **That Council be recommended to approve that the budget for the Water Gardens (North) capital works be brought forward from 17/18 to support feasibility work in 14/15 with construction to follow.**

Bus Interchange and Market Square

- 12 That progress on the Bus Interchange and Market Square project be noted.
- 13 That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, to conclude matters regarding the TRO consultations and approve the completion of the TROs noted in paragraph 43 of the background to the report.
- 14 That, following the completion of the TROs consultation, as per recommendation 13, works on the project can progress.

Reason for Decision

To enable the projects to move forward.

Implications

Financial

Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court

Additional budget for the Marlowes and Bank Court Improvements

There is currently a combined budget of £3.38million (£2.84 million Marlowes Shopping Zone (BP009) and £539,000 Bank Court (BP027) available for the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements including Bank Court.

Approximately £270,000 of this budget is required for associated costs including design fees, fees for cost manager, employer's agent, solicitor fees, CDM Coordinator and Design Monitors fees, planning, licenses and other statutory consents and communications.

Therefore the available overall budget for construction is approximately £3.11million.

Following a two stage tender process (PQQ and ITT) for the appointment of the main construction contractor for the Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court improvements, two tender responses were received both of which were significantly over the currently available budget.

Whilst the Landscape Architects designed the scheme and monitored costs up to January 2014 with the advice of their Cost Managers to fit within our available budget , there has been a recent spike in construction costs linked to an increase in demand for contractors combined with a lack of supply of labour and materials.

Officers in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration have considered and adopted a number of value engineering options to reduce the costs. By doing this we have reduced the cost of the tenders significantly to approximately £3.323million. However there is still a shortfall of £213,000 and any further value engineering is likely to compromise both the design and quality of the scheme significantly.

There are likely to be unforeseen problems such as utility issues, sub-base issues etc. Therefore in addition to the above shortfall, we recommend the allocation of a contingency budget of 8% of the construction and associated cost (£287,000) towards this scheme. Members will note that the original budget included a contingency estimate, but that this amount has been fully utilised by the higher than expected tendered costs. The Council's appointed Cost Managers have advised that 8% is an appropriate level of contingency subject to the Client not making any changes to the scheme.

A total additional budget of £500,000 (£213,000 towards construction and £287,000 towards a contingency budget) is sought for the Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court improvement project. All figures have been rounded off to the nearest thousand.

Budget for replacement toilets and replacement ticketing facility

Due to the planned redevelopment of Market Square, the existing public toilets in Market Square will no longer be available. Similarly, the existing bus ticketing facility

will no longer be available. Both facilities need to be provided close to the new Bus Interchange facility.

Whilst these facilities will support the new Bus Interchange, their location falls within the Marlowes Shopping Zone. Therefore it is recommended that these works are undertaken with the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements to minimise disruption and deliver value for money.

We have received initial quotes which indicate that the cost of this facility will be £100,000. We also recommend a contingency of 20%, equating to £20,000. A contingency level higher than the norm is recommended for these works because plans for the toilets are at a very early stage and the quotes received are initial estimates. We therefore recommend a virement of £120,000 from the Bus Interchange budget to the Marlowes Shopping Zone budget to undertake these works as part of the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements.

Merging Marlowes Shopping Zone and Bank Court Cost Centres

A budget of £539,000 was approved under the Capital Programme for the regeneration of Bank Court. This budget is currently held in its own cost centre BP027. Bank Court is being delivered as part of the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements by the same contractor in order to deliver a seamless scheme and value for money. Therefore many of the costs incurred including fees, expenses and materials cover both projects and are invoiced together. In order to reduce administrative complications and additional staff time resolving such complications, it is recommended that the Marlowes Shopping Zone (BP009) and Bank Court (BP027) cost centres are merged.

Value for Money

Marlowes Shopping Zone, Bank Court

The proposed designs for the Marlowes Shopping Zone reflects significant value for money by delivering improvements that will make a distinctive, creative, visual and practical improvement to Hemel Hempstead town centre. The scheme has been value engineered and alternative options considered to reduce costs without impacting on the quality of the scheme.

We have strived to achieve further value for money by considering the installation of the public toilet and bus ticketing facility as part of the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements to avoid additional costs and inconvenience that would be incurred if construction is done as part of the Bus Interchange works instead.

Further, savings are expected due to more efficient use of resources for the cleaning and maintenance of the new toilets.

Value for money has also been achieved through the procurement process for the Marlowes Shopping Zone with value engineering being part of the selection process.

The schemes are being delivered in conjunction with wider regeneration in the town centre to maximise the scope for economic growth and increased footfall.

Water Gardens

In October 2013 Capital Strategy Steering Group approved £560,000 to deliver the Access and Movement Improvement Project, which was considered by Cabinet as part of the draft capital programme in February 2014.

The capital programme also includes provision for a car park refurbishment programme, with funding of £280,000 in 2014/15 and £100,000 per annum for four years from 2015/16. A separate figure of £400,000 is allocated for improvement works to Water Gardens decked car park in 17/18, which will require bringing forward to support project delivery.

Combining the Access and Movement Improvement Project with the proposed capital works to the Water Gardens (North) car park would ensure a co-ordinated approach to all works associated with the car parks through the design process. In order to minimise disruption to visitors during the construction phase and benefit from any economies of scale, it is intended that these works be added to the Water Gardens contract, provided that this does not impede the delivery of the Water Gardens project.

Members will note that this work is entirely separate from the recent bid made to the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund for the Water Gardens restoration.

Bus Interchange and Market Square

Following approval from Members and HCC that no Public Inquiry is required, savings will be made as the cost of the Inquiry would have impacted on this projects' budget and delivery.

As mentioned above we have strived to achieve further value for money by considering the installation of the public toilet and bus ticketing facility as part of the Marlowes Shopping Zone improvements to avoid additional costs and inconvenience that would be incurred if construction is done as part of the Bus Interchange works instead.

Risk Implications

Risk Assessment included as part of the PID for Marlowes Shopping Zone, Market Square and Bus Station Regeneration and Water Gardens projects.

Corporate Objectives

The Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan supports the Council's vision and in particular the corporate objective of Regeneration.

Advice

The Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Regeneration summarised the report. The Council was close to agreeing the contractor for the Marlowes shopping centre. Modifications had been made to the food court area as detailed in appendix 1 of the report, including a new public toilet facility and a kiosk for a ticketing facility for the bus interchange.

Regarding Marlowes shopping zone and Bank Court, there had been a rise in the cost of the scheme and £500k extra funding was required towards the regeneration project. There would be a virement to help with this.

The Leader of the Council said the modifications were sensible and would bring the project forward.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Regeneration referred to page 12 of the report regarding the combined Water Gardens car park and the access and movement project which were two important pieces of work in the town centre. There would be public consultation. There would be a public announcement on the outcome of the Heritage Lottery Funding budget on 7 July. The report made clear the benefits of linking the access and car park improvement. There will be a green screen put in to shield the car park from the gardens.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services said the residents of Cotterells would be sure to engage with the consultation on the access and movement project.

Regarding the bus interchange and Market Square project, the Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Regeneration referred to the virement of £120k as detailed in the S151 officer's comments.

In terms of latest costings, it was likely the full budget set for the bus interchange project would be required. There was significant cost price inflation in the construction industry.

The key issue was around the recent consultation carried out for TROs to support implementation of the bus interchange and these were detailed in the appendices to the report. One objection had been raised regarding the provision of disabled parking. Advice received from Hertfordshire County Council and legal officers was that this was not sufficient to merit a public inquiry and Hertfordshire County Council had said Dacorum Borough Council was free to make the TRO.

The Leader of the Council said this was significant progress for the regeneration scheme and it was an exciting time for the town. The Leader of the Council hoped to get a good result on 7 July regarding Heritage Lottery Funding.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

James Stammers, Transformation Programme Manager for DBC, V4 Services; James Deane, Assistant Director, Finance and Resources, DBC; Yaqubul Islam, Senior Accountant, DBC; Mike Evans, Group Manager Commercial Assets and Property Development, DBC; Steven Barnes, Lead Officer Parking Policy, DBC.

Voting

None.

CA/073/14 DISCRETIONARY BUSINESS RATE RELIEF SCHEME

Decision

1. That the additional discretionary business rate reliefs (appendix 1 of the report) be approved for:
 - a. Retail businesses.
 - b. Re-occupation of long-term empty retail premises.
 - c. Empty new-build premises.
 - d. Premises affected by flooding.
2. That the additional local council tax discount for domestic properties affected by flooding be approved (appendix 2 of the report).

Reason for Decision

To enable the adoption of additional discretionary rate relief and council tax discounts as recommended by Government.

Implications

Financial

Government has stated that it will meet the full costs of reliefs and discounts granted in line with its recommendations, and so there is no financial cost to the Council.

Risk Implications

There is a risk of reputational damage if the Council is not seen to be taking action based on these Government recommendations.

Corporate Objectives

These reliefs and discount will support the corporate objective of regeneration and economy.

Advice

The Group Manager Revenues, Benefits and Fraud introduced the report and said the Local Government Finance Act gave local authorities discretionary powers to put short term Government actions in place. These schemes are fully funded by the Government. A summary of the reliefs is:

- Up to £1000.00 rate relief for retail businesses
- Re-occupation relief of 50% for 18 months to encourage re-occupation of retail units empty for 12 months or more.

- New build empty property relief – a reduction in business rates to nil for the first 18 months after a property is built, while it remains empty, to encourage building.
- Flood support relief and discount – 100% relief from business rates or council tax for 3 months for premises affected by flooding between 1 December 2013 and 31 March 2014.

The Group Manager Revenues, Benefits and Fraud reassured the Portfolio Holder for Housing that this would be at nil cost to the Council.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability asked if applications would come straight to officers or to an Appeals Committee.

The Group Manager Revenues, Benefits and Fraud said these would be dealt with by officers.

The Leader of the Council said these reliefs brought into effect announcements made in the Chancellor's statement.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

There was no consultation.

Voting

None.

CA/074/14 PEST CONTROL SERVICE: PROPOSED CHANGES

Decision

1. That the Council's Pest Control Service be revised as follows:
 - a. Charge for rats in domestic premises.
 - b. Provide a chargeable service for other pests including mice, wasps and fleas.
 - c. Further develop services in the commercial sector.
2. That charges for the service be introduced as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

Reason for Decision

To enable the propose changes to the Council's Pest Control Service to be implemented.

Implications

Financial

Any initial outlay of resource will be offset by the income generated once charging is implemented.

Value for Money

Introducing charges for pest control will generate income while giving access to a greater number of residents.

Risk Implications

There is a risk that some residents will no longer use the pest control service once charges are introduced. This is highly unlikely according to the experience of other LA's that have introduced similar low cost charges. The Operations team has a number of commercial contracts to maintain the service if there was to be reduced take up initially.

Corporate Objectives

Resources and Value For Money

Optimise Resources and Implement Best Practice.

Clean and Safe

Ridding environments of pests and vermin will have an overall public health benefit for Dacorum.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services introduced the report which proposed the introduction of some fees. The report had been considered and endorsed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Residents' concerns had been taken into consideration and the service would be reviewed within 12 months to see if any further concerns had been raised.

The Group Manager Regulatory Services said the proposal was to introduce a charge for the control of rats on domestic properties. The proposed charges, detailed at appendix 1 of the report, had been bench marked with other authorities in Hertfordshire. The £40.00 charge for rats (£10.00 for Dacorum Card holders) would include three visits.

The second proposal was to increase the range of pest control services operated by the Council and to cover not just rats but other pests including mice, fleas, wasps. The third proposal was to further develop the service in the commercial sector. The Group Manager Regulatory services said they have a small number of commercial contracts but they would like to expand on these. Regulatory Services are currently in discussions with Hertfordshire County Council and have offered to provide pest control services in a number of HCC establishments. This is subject to HCC's procurement and tendering requirements.

Regarding the charges, other authorities had found an initial drop in take up but people were willing to pay for the service and it gave residents accountability. The charges would be exclusive of VAT.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability said there was no mention of glis glis which were a local problem.

The Group Manager Regulatory Services said glis glis control was very resource intensive as they had to be shot not poisoned. The initial priority was to get the service properly up and running to deal with rats. This service may be considered at later date.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing expressed concern that the report implied there would be a charge to tenants. This would give other challenges as tenants had not been consulted. The Portfolio Holder had understood the Council would have a Service Level Agreement.

The Group Manager Regulatory Services said there was an agreement with Housing that pests were dealt with and the service paid for. Housing would pay for the majority of their tenants, unless it was the tenant's fault.

The Leader of the Council asked if the Council currently treated all pests as detailed in appendix 1 of the report or just rats.

The Group Manager Regulatory Services the service currently covered rats with no charge. Commercial charges were not included in appendix 1 as these are bespoke to the individual needs of the business and likely to be more than domestic rate.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Clean, Safe and Green;
Cllr N Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services; and
Caroline Souto.

Voting

None.

CA/075/14 FINAL OUTTURN REPORT

This report was withdrawn as there were no further changes made by the Audit Committee on 17 June 2014.

CA/076/14 FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

Decision

That Council be recommended to approve the amendments to the Financial Regulations, as outlined in the report.

Reason for Decision

To enable the proposed changes to the Council's Financial Regulations to be implemented.

Implications

Financial

Robust and relevant Financial Regulations underpin the Council's ability to function effectively both financially and operationally.

Value for Money

See above.

Risk Implications

There were no risk implications.

Corporate Objectives

The efficacy of the Financial Regulations supports all of the Council's objectives.

Advice

The Corporate Director Finance and Operations introduced the report and said the proposed version of the Financial Regulations was available to view in full via the following link:

<http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/council-democracy/resources-14-06-04-item-12--financial-regulations-appendix-a.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

The report set out the proposed amendments.

- Paragraph 7 of the report proposed postholder grades be given set authorisation levels.
- Paragraph 8 of the report referred to virements. It was proposed to adjust the amount of transfer through virements that need Cabinet approval to over £50k or 10% of the transferring budget.
- Paragraph 9 of the report clarified when a purchase order was required.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing asked how virements under £50k would be controlled.

The Corporate Director Finance and Operations said he as Corporate Director Finance and Operations would agree those. Any particularly challenging or high profile transfers would be brought to Cabinet as a point of reference.

The Leader of the Council said virements currently came to Cabinet with one line of description and he was happy to rely on officers' advice on these.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The Corporate Management Team;
Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee (4 June 2014);
Audit Committee (17 June 2014).

Voting

None.

CA/077/14 COMMISSIONING AND PROCUREMENT REVIEW

Decision

1. **That Council be recommended to approve:**
2. **The recommended changes identified in the report in relation to the approach the Council takes when undertaking commissioning and procurement activities.**
3. **The adoption of the Commissioning and Procurement Strategy (appendix 1 of the report) that provides clear strategic direction and support to the Council's Corporate Plan.**
4. **The amendments to the Commissioning and Procurement Standing Orders (appendix 2 of the report) that form part of the Council's Constitution.**
5. **A budget of £75k, to be funded from the Management of Change Reserve, for the appointment of V4 Services to support the implementation of category management across the Council.**

Reason for Decision

To recommend Council to approve changes to the approach the Council takes when undertaking commissioning and procurement activities.

Implications

Financial

There will be some financial cost to the Council for these recommendations, in particular with the support with the implementation of Category Management, it is envisaged that the cost of any changes will be recovered from the savings that these recommendations will generate.

Value for Money

Implementing these recommendations provides clarity on the planning, delivery and monitoring of the commissioning and procurement activities of the Council which will support Corporate Objectives as indicated in the Corporate Plan as a result this will demonstrate a positive effect on Value for Money.

Risk Implications

There is a risk that should the Council choose not to implement all of these recommendations then it will not be able to demonstrate its commissioning and procurement activities align with its Corporate Plan and maximise the benefits that this approach will deliver.

The Council must ensure that it complies with the Public Contract Regulations 2006 (as amended) and the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, equal treatment and proportionality when carrying out commissioning and procurement activities.

Corporate Objectives

The recommendations will ensure that all commissioning and procurement activities of the Council will support the Corporate Objectives as indicated in the Corporate Plan.

Advice

The Leader of the Council asked members to take into account the part 2 referral from the Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4 June.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services introduced the report which was in response to an in depth review. This had been to the Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee twice and they still had some concerns about it.

Councillor J Marshall, Chairman of the Housing and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee, had sent an email to Cabinet members raising points of concern.

The Group Manager of Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance said the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had raised two concerns:

1. Raising of the awarded levels for awarding contracts. The reason the Council has increased the level for award of contracts by officers is that over the last 16 years there has never been an award of contract called in. This demonstrated there was a robust process in place for awarding contracts. All awarding of contracts was done in line with the budget set and there was no added value in going through the current Portfolio Holder process that has a call in procedure.

This would speed up the process and enable projects to move forward quicker. They will continue to go through a robust evaluation process and comments would still be received from the S151 and Monitoring Officers.

2. Social value and use of the voluntary sector. The concern was there should be much more recognition of the voluntary sector in Commissioning Standing Orders. The Council is a public sector organisation and everyone has to be treated equally. The market approached by the Council would be a mixture of all markets. To name a market and say the Council should be moving to work more towards them would jeopardise the Council and may be perceived as the Council favouring a particular market.

The current rules were supported by a Commissioning and Procurement Strategy as demonstrated in Appendix 1 of the report, page 5 under Building Community Capacity, 'Work with the voluntary and community sector to encourage civic participation.' The Council's approach to procurement would be working with the voluntary sector without particularly spelling it out.

The Leader of the Council said he did not have concerns with the raising of the thresholds of the limits as long as those decisions were within budget and had been approved by Council.

The Council had to have a level playing field in the procurement process and should not suggest preference for a particular kind of contract in that process. Sometimes it was not easy for small organisations to access the process and it would be good to be reassured that other options would be looked at and local social enterprise options be considered. Managers and staff involved in contracting should be trained and supported to understand the Council needed to look at all options and perhaps to go to small local voluntary sector organisations and give them the opportunity to tender. The Council needed to be more proactive in evolving its vision.

The Group Manager of Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance said the Commissioning and Procurement Standing Orders were in two areas:

- Contracts up to £50k
- Contracts above £50k

For contracts up to £50k there was clear guidance and templates for officers to get quotations themselves and to use local companies where appropriate.

For contracts above £50k, each activity would be supported by a fully qualified procurement Council officer. There would be a number of questions asked and one would be around identifying the need and the market. The whole of the market including public, voluntary and private would be looked at.

Regarding awareness and training, all officers undertaking procurement below £50k would undertake training. This should increase the value of spend locally and increase the level of spend with the voluntary sector. There would be a forward plan that would be published and officers would ensure all sectors of the market will know where to get information.

The Leader of the Council said he was reassured and happy to support the recommendation.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

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

A consultation exercise was carried out in the latter part of 2013 on existing procurement support (including the Strategy and Procurement Standing Orders) this was with Group Managers, Team Leaders and Officers.

Voting

None.

CA/078/14 OATRIDGE GARDENS: COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS

Decision

That a 100% local council tax discount for residents of Oatridge Gardens be approved starting from 15 February 2014, and ending on the date all utility services are reconnected.

Reason for Decision

To enable a local council tax discount of 100% for residents of Oatridge Gardens affected by the sinkhole.

Implications

Financial

The cost of a local council tax discount will need to be met in full from Dacorum Borough Council funds. This is covered in more detail in the body of the report.

Risk Implications

There is a risk of reputational damage if the Council is not seen to be taking action to support these residents.

Corporate Objectives

This discount will support **Building Community Capacity** by assisting the residents of Oatridge Gardens during a difficult time.

Advice

The Group Manager Revenues, Benefits and Fraud summarised the report and said, if agreed, the full cost would fall on the Council as the billing authority. This scheme was to support the residents of Oatridge Gardens through a difficult time when they were without all the utilities. The recommendation was to provide a locally paid for reduction to the residents' council tax until the date utilities were reconnected. There was no indication when this would be as yet.

The Leader of the Council said it was the right thing to do in the circumstances and the Council should give financial support to those affected.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

There was no consultation.

Voting

None.

CA/079/14 VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT POLICY

Decision

That the Volunteer Management Policy be approved.

Reason for Decision

To approve the new Volunteer Management Policy.

Implications

Financial

Expenses and travel within existing service budgets.

Value for Money

This policy seeks to improve the treatment of existing volunteers and increase the networks of volunteers within the community. This will improve the local area; build skills and aspiration of local people, providing value for money.

Risk Implications

If this Policy is not approved we will continue to see a difference in how volunteers are managed between departments. Poor management of volunteers can cause a negative volunteering experience, reducing the number of long term volunteers that we involve in the organisation. This negative experience of working with the Council can contribute to poor reputation within the Community.

Corporate Objectives

1. Community Capacity: enabling self-help and volunteering to build communities.
2. Regeneration: developing skills and aspirations of local people.
3. Dacorum Delivers: developing more effective ways of delivering services which meet customer expectations.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services said a lot of Council departments used volunteers. The Council has adopted a Volunteer Management Policy helped by the volunteer centre.

The Community Partnerships Officer said the aim was to provide a fair and consistent approach to volunteers across the authority. The Council had to ensure the volunteers were well managed and that the Council adhered to legal practices.

Consultation had taken place with the relevant departments. External organisations had consulted with Unison. Tenants had been consulted. It was proposed that a Volunteer Management Group be set up externally to manage the volunteer recruitment process.

There would be internal training provided for volunteer management for all volunteer supervisors.

The Leader of the Council said he supported the policy.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The following internal and external stakeholders have been consulted;

- DBC staff – Resident Services, Community Partnerships, Tenant Involvement, HR, Insurance and Risk Management, Health and Safety.
- External organisations: Unison, Volunteer Centre Dacorum

Residents: Tenant and Leaseholder group, Neighbourhood Action Steering groups, Individual volunteers involved through departments outlined above.

Voting

None.

CA/080/14 DACORUM LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK: PRE-SUBMISSION SITE ALLOCATIONS

Decision

1. That key issues arising from Issues and Options Consultation, the Core Strategy and new information and advice be noted.
2. **That Council be recommended to approve the Site Allocations Pre-Submission documents for publication and comment.**
3. **That Council be recommended to delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Planning Development and Regeneration), to finalise the Report of Consultation and Sustainability Appraisal and, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, to make any factual or non-substantive changes and amendments to the Pre-Submission Site Allocations and to insert the Indicative Spatial Layout plan into Policy LA3 West Hemel Hempstead prior to consultation commencing.**
4. **That Council be recommended to approve the Site Allocations for publication, seeking representations in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and relevant regulations.**
5. **That Council be recommended to approve the following procedure for considering future issues on the Site Allocations:**
 - (a) **If significant new issues are raised in the representations on the forthcoming consultation, to report to Cabinet and Council for a decision as to whether any change to the Site Allocations is justified;**
 - (b) **If there are no significant new issues, to delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) to:**
 - (i) **Submit the Site Allocations for Examination; and**
 - (ii) **In consultation with the Planning and Regeneration Portfolio Holder, to agree any minor changes to the Site Allocations to resolve objections and improve clarity of the document.**

Reason for Decision

To agree the Pre-Submission Site Allocations document and arrangements for consultation and submission.

Implications

The process of preparing the Site Allocations as part of the Local Planning Framework (LPF) has financial implications. The Council has created a 'Local Planning Framework' earmarked reserve to support expenditure. Money is drawn down from this reserve to provide an annual budget to support LPF-related work.

Having an up-to-date planning policy framework helps reduce the incidence of planning appeals (and thus costs associated with those). It will also be the most effective way of ensuring the optimum level of developer contributions to infrastructure and in mitigation of development impacts can be achieved.

Like the Core Strategy, the Site Allocations document, once adopted, can be subject to legal challenge and costs associated with this process.

Risk Implications

A full risk assessment has been carried out as part of the PID for the Local Planning Framework. These risks are reviewed monthly through CORVU and reported each year through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Identified risks include failure of external agencies or consultants to deliver on time, change in Government policy and team capacity. If the Council were to decide not to progress the Site Allocations DPD, significant additional risks would arise. These would relate to a lack of an up-to-date framework upon which to base planning decisions within the Borough, and the likelihood of a significant increase in speculative planning applications (and potentially appeals), particularly for housing development in the Green Belt, which would prove hard to defend. There would also be financial implications i.e. extra costs associated with planning appeals and inquiries.

Corporate Objectives

The Site Allocations forms part of the Council's Local Planning Framework, which as a whole helps support all 5 corporate objectives:

- *Safe and clean environment:* e.g. contains policies relating to the design and layout of new development that promote security and safe access.
- *Community Capacity:* e.g. provide a framework for local communities to prepare area-specific guidance such as Neighbourhood Plans, Town / Village Plans etc.
- *Affordable housing:* e.g. sets the Borough's overall housing target and the proportion of new homes that must be affordable.
- *Dacorum delivers:* e.g. provides a clear framework upon which planning decisions can be made.

Regeneration: e.g. sets the planning framework for key regeneration projects, such as Hemel Hempstead town centre and the Maylands Business Park.

Advice

The Leader of the Council introduced the report which he said was in light of the adopted Core Strategy and was further work on the Local Allocations sites.

The Leader of the Council invited Councillor Guest to make her statement.

Councillor Guest said there were a number of public who would like to speak.

The Leader of the Council said as there had been no advance notification of public participation this would not be allowed.

Councillor Guest made the following statement:

It was sad that in developing the Core Strategy, it was decided to release land at LA3 for development. On these sweeping vistas between Fields End and Chaulden Vale, neighbouring residents have reported seeing bats and badgers and hearing the song of the lark.

Now that decision has been made, this Council needs to ensure that what is done at LA3 is in the best interests of local people and the natural and built environment.

This report recommends that the Cabinet approve the procedure by which if significant new issues are raised during the consultation in the autumn, Cabinet and Council would make a decision as to whether a change to the Site Allocations is justified. What issues could justify LA3 or any of the other allocations being taken out of the plan?

The Site Allocations document will form part of the Council's Local Planning framework which helps to support all of the Council's five corporate objectives. One of these is a safe and clean environment. Would the loss of wildlife habitat conflict with this objective? Another objective is "Dacorum Delivers" which includes providing a clear framework in which planning decisions can be made. In making planning decisions appropriate conditions must be made and enforced. In part of Fields End it was a planning condition that the developers must provide adequate drainage. The developer breached planning conditions by not doing so, and there are properties at Fields End which are subject to flooding but it is too late to enforce the condition. Can we be confident that such a scenario will not happen at LA3?

The health and safety implications of this policy had to be considered. The report states that these are included in the planning issues relating to the Site Allocations. One of the two main accesses to LA3 will be opposite the Chaulden Adventure Playground where young children may be going unaccompanied. Have the road safety implications of this been assessed? If a Gypsy and Traveller site is located at the corner of Pouchen End Lane and Chaulden Lane, have the ability of these narrow lanes to take caravans been assessed?

The report for this item states that advice from key stakeholders such as the Local Education Authority and Highway Authority has been sought where appropriate. Has the Highway Authority's view on the road safety implications of the LA3 development been taken into account? Has the Local Education Authority's view on the need for a primary school been considered? The Parkwood Drive GP surgery does not want to open a branch surgery at LA3 but has NHS England been lobbied about persuading another GP practice to set up at LA3. Have the local infrastructure needs of LA3 been understood and considered?

It is intended that the Local Allocations will provide new homes from 2021 onwards. However the lead-in period means that planning applications will be received and determined before 2021 and construction may take place before then. That seems to be saying that buildings could be erected whilst LA3 is still Green Belt. Would this not encourage rather than deter speculative and predatory applications?

Why is the indicative spatial layout for LA3 not yet ready when it appears that the others are? This layout is being drawn up by consultants working for the developers. Will it show what is needed in the area or will it indicate the maximum number of

dwellings per hectare that can be squeezed in to maximise profits for the developers, and put strain on the infrastructure that will be provided?

The section of the report on the Duty to Co-Operate refers to replies by Bedford, North Herts and Chiltern Councils. What response have we received from St. Albans, an adjoining authority which covers land at East Hemel Hempstead, and with whom the need to co-operate is most critical?

These questions need to be answered to ensure that we as a Council give the best deal possible to current residents, to future residents of the Local Allocations and to the environment in which we all live.

The Leader of the Council thanked Councillor Guest for her statement and asked that her points be addressed.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Regeneration said the report sought authority to consult on the pre-submission versions of the site allocations document. The Core Strategy had been approved to 2031 and this document put the detail on that document and set out development guidance on the six allocations and on other sites. The document had been made available to members via the DBC website.

The challenge to the Core Strategy had failed. The judge supported the Council on all points of submission and this was available to view on the website.

The document provided the detail on the strategy that had been approved. The six local allocations, particularly LA3, were included at strategic level as they were critical to the Council's housing land supplies. This document did not seek to look again at the Council's housing target or the green belt boundary.

Regarding LA3, the Council was in discussion with consultants and developers seeking to bring forward this land. A lot of work had been done with the local community to bring a robust plan.

The spatial layout document was almost complete and would be circulated to members shortly and be considered by Cabinet on 22 July.

Regarding LA5, a lot of work had been done with the developer and the Task and Finish Group. The proposal was to bring this site forward to deliver prior to 2021. Early delivery of gypsy and traveller sites was key.

Consultation would start in September 2014 for 6 weeks. If no alterations were needed, there would be a formal submission in summer 2015, subject to public examination.

A lot of the questions could be addressed by members of the public and the Council would respond formally at that time.

Referring to the Duty to Co-Operate, the Team Leader for Strategic Planning and Regeneration said Chiltern District Council agreed to continue with discussion across issues and liaise with further work. There were no issues raised.

A telephone call had been received from English Heritage – they were generally happy with the document and the approach being taken and had raised no significant issues.

The NHS was looking forward to reading and commenting on some of the consultation. They were pleased to see medical provision on the LA3 site. They had given new contact details of the new Commissioning Group.

No other formal responses had been received from other authorities. On-going discussions were being held with Hertfordshire County Council, particularly with Highways and Education.

Regarding the issues raised by Councillor Guest, the Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Regeneration said these could be raised by residents when the document goes forward for consultation.

- Drainage - the Council had given a commitment that the drainage study would look not only at the surface water drainage generated by the site but also by the surrounding farmland. There had been flooding at Fields End and lessons would be learned from that.
- Sustainable urban drainage would be in the Masterplan and would need the approval of Hertfordshire County Council.
- Highway liaison - discussions were taking place with Hertfordshire County Council and these matters would be addressed in the Masterplan process.
- Adventure playgrounds - it was Hertfordshire County Council's usual practice to carry out a safety audit.
- Education – the development makes provision for a new school.
- GP surgery – the Council continues to discuss GP provision with the health authorities.
- Green belt designation – no building would take place until the formal designation of land had changed.
- Speculation and predatory applications – it was important that the Council brings forward these local allocations because if they do not it will be subject to predatory and speculative applications.
- Consultants – consultants were working for the developers. Approval of the master plan would ultimately be a matter for the Council. The Council was getting value for money that way.
- Density of development – The size of the development is 900 units. This is a matter for more future detailed design work.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing referred to the flooding issue. There had been a major problem at Kings Copse which was not a developer issue but a Thames Water issue. The system had to be upgraded. Can the Council ensure that other outside agencies do what they need to?

The Team Leader for Strategic Planning and Regeneration said the Council had been encouraging the developers to engage with Thames Water and other utilities. There was a requirement for early liaison with Thames Water and the Sustainable Drainage Approval body. The Council was dealing with Barratt and Wimpey who would be encouraged to liaise with these agencies.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services asked how much information would be available during the various consultations about gypsy and traveller sites and if people would be asked where they wanted these sites.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Development and Regeneration said it was one consultation document and gypsy and traveller sites would be in it. The Core Strategy set a minimum expectation for gypsy and traveller provision (17 pitches across the borough by 2031). The other approach in the Core Strategy was that, where possible, gypsy and traveller sites could be built into local provision. The Council would respond to residents' views.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability asked for confirmation that the consultation would be on LA 1 – 6 only, not the other sites being put forward in the plan.

The Team Leader for Strategic Planning and Regeneration said two consultations were being run in parallel. The Site Allocations Document had to be consulted on in order to give some certainty to residents and, to begin working with developers, the Council had decided to prepare a Masterplan and consult on those in parallel. The public can comment on the smaller sites or on the local allocations. Documents were the site allocations as a whole and the Masterplan for the green belt released sites.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability asked where people could find that information currently.

The Team Leader for Strategic Planning and Regeneration said there was a section in the Site Allocations document. After the July Cabinet the detailed Masterplans would be published.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services asked that the Council ensure it was easy for residents to get to the relevant pages on the website.

The Team Leader for Strategic Planning and Regeneration said the Council would be ensuring it was easy to locate. If a resident typed in LA3 the website would take you straight to that page. Communications were helping with this.

The Leader of the Council said the LA sites were particularly challenging. The Council knew it was still very challenged to deliver the housing needed for the next 15 – 20 years and these sites played a very important part with that delivery.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation on the Site Allocations DPD has been carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), adopted by the Council in June 2006.

The nature and scope of this consultation is set out within the Reports of Consultation that followed the 2006 and 2008 Issues and Options Consultations.

Advice from key stakeholders, such as the Local Education Authority and Highway Authority, has been sought where appropriate. Feedback on the Council's

Infrastructure Delivery Plan has also been significant in developing a clear understanding of local infrastructure needs. This advice is referred to within the relevant Background Issues paper that form part of the Site Allocations DPD evidence base.

The Consultation Reports relating to the Core Strategy (Volumes 1-7) are also relevant.

In terms of internal processes, a Task and Finish Group have advised on the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. There have been reports to Cabinet at key stages in the preparation of the Local Planning Framework and the Planning and Regeneration Portfolio Holder has been kept apprised of progress.

Voting

None.

CA/081/14 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 the financial and business affairs of the Council and third party companies/organisations

Local Government Act 1975, Part V, Schedule 12A, Paragraph 3.

CA/082/14 REFERALLS TO CABINET

Decision

Finance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 4 June 2014

OS/122/14 – Procurement Review

That the referral be considered with item 14 on the agenda (minute CA/077/14).

CA/083/14 RESULT OF THE EVALUATION OF FINAL SUBMISSIONS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE QUARTER AND GADE ZONE REGENERATION PROCUREMENT AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Decision

That the meeting be adjourned and reconvened after full Council on 9 July 2014 to consider this decision.

Reason for Decision

To confirm the preferred bidder and agree the approach to signing of the contract and finalising the development agreement between the Council and the development partners, after the funding issue had been agreed by full Council.

Implications

Financial

The indicative financial implications are set out in the report.

Value for Money

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Risk Implications

With regard to PSQ and Gade Zone a new risk assessment and management plan will be agreed with the successful development partner following selection which will set out key risks and mitigation. A separate internal risk register will be developed alongside this. To date risks have been managed through the projects exiting risk register.

Corporate Objectives

Dacorum Delivers: Maximising the value of Council Assets and providing Value for Money. The use of the Civic Centre will avoid decant costs and consolidation of use of the space will reduce running costs. The PSQ will be a more cost efficient building to operate than the Civic Centre.

Regeneration. The Gade Zone Regeneration project is aimed primarily to deliver significant regeneration in the town centre. It facilitates the creation of a new community focused building housing public sector and voluntary sector partners, a new commercial leisure facility developing more family friendly and evening attractions into the town centre and much needed new homes. Subsequent development of the Civic Centre and college sites will bring further new investment into the town centre, most likely for new housing.

Affordable Housing. Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Safe and Clean Environment. The PSQ will be built to 'BREEAM excellent' standard and the design of all new town centre development will be guided by the Town Centre Masterplan which sets out high sustainability requirements.

Advice

The Leader of the Council 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:

The Monitoring Officer;
The S 151 Officer;
James Doe, Assistant Director Planning and Regeneration;
James Deane, Assistant Director Finance and Resources;
Ben Hosier, Group Manager Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance;
Mike Evans, Group Manager Commercial assets and Property Development;
Mark Brookes, Group Manager, Legal Governance.

Voting

None.

CA/084/14 COMMISSIONING AND PROCUREMENT REVIEW **- APPENDIX 3 OF AGENDA ITEM 14**

Decision

That this paper be considered with agenda item 14.

CA/085/14 COUNCIL NEW BUILD – QUEEN STREET, TRING

Decision

That the recommendation as detailed in the report be approved.

Full details are in the Part II minute.

Reason for Decision

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Implications

Financial

Contained within the body of the report.

Risk Implications

Risk Assessment completed within the New Build PID.

Corporate Objectives

Affordable housing.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced the report.

Full details are in the Part II minute.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

The New Build Project Group, including:

The Corporate Director Housing and Regeneration;
The Assistant Director Finance and Operations;
The Assistant Director Housing; and
The Group Manager Commercial Assets and Property.

Voting

None.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm.