

## MINUTES

### CABINET

13 DECEMBER 2016

**Present:**

**Members:**

**Councillors:** Williams (Leader)  
Griffiths (Deputy  
Leader)  
Elliot  
Harden  
Marshall  
G Sutton

<b>Officers:</b>	Sally Marshall	Chief Executive
	James Deane	Corporate Director - Finance and Operations
	Mark Gaynor	Corporate Director - Housing & Regeneration
	Mark Brookes	Solicitor to the Council and Monitoring Officer
	Elliott Brooks	Assistant Director - Housing
	James Doe	Assistant Director - Planning and Regeneration
	Robert Smyth	Assistant Director - Performance, People and Innovation
	Richard Baker	Group Manager - Financial Services
	Francis Whittaker	Strategic Planning & Regeneration Officer
	Laura Wood	Strategic Planning & Regeneration Team Leader

The meeting began at 7.30 pm

#### **CA/120/15 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2016 were agreed by the members present and signed by the Chairman.

#### **CA/121/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None received

#### **CA/122/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Marshall and Elliot declared a Personal Interest in Item 17 of the agenda, as they were members of Sportspace.

## **CA/123/15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

- Councillor Guest
- Lee Royal on behalf of West Hemel Action Group
- Gruff Edwards on behalf of Dacorum Environmental Forum

Each made a statement regarding agenda item 14 'Dacorum Local Planning Framework Site Allocations Development Plan Document Proposed Modifications'.  
Minute CA/133/16.

## **CA/124/15 REFERRALS TO CABINET**

None

## **CA/125/15 CABINET FORWARD PLAN**

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

- January – Add 'Senior Officer Pay Policy'
- January – Add 'Peer Review findings'
- January – Move 'HRA Business Plan Review' to February.
- February – Add 'Appointment of Auditors 2017 & beyond'
- April – Add 'Grovehill Neighbourhood Plan'

## **CA/126/15 LEISURE REVIEW - REFURBISHING TRING SWIMMING POOL**

### **Decision**

1. A refurbishment plan based on the alternative version of Option 1 as outlined in section 4: The Proposed Way Forward be approved
2. To commission and manage the refurbishment of Tring Swimming Pool and that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Performance, People & Innovation) in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resident and Corporate Services to procure and complete the contract for works.

### **Reason for Decision**

For Cabinet to review and approve the recommendations for refurbishing Tring Swimming Pool.

### **Community Impact Assessment**

Community Impact Assessment carried out

### **Corporate Objectives**

Clean, Safe and Enjoyable Environment – Swimming provision is central to delivering a borough that people can enjoy. This review will help ensure our approach continues to meet the needs of current and future residents.

### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

#### **Monitoring Officer:**

The Council will need to ensure that it has documented agreement with Tring School prior to commencing the procurement process and complete the required access licences to carry out the work.

The award of contact will need to follow a regulated procurement process and the build contract documented in an appropriate form of JCT contract.

#### **S.151 Officer:**

The costs of this project can be accommodated within the currently approved capital budget.

### **Advice**

R Smyth noted that option 1 included the removal of the school changing rooms as lots of work was being done.

Councillor Williams added that there was currently no need to refurbish the school changing rooms.

### **Voting**

None.

### **CA/127/15 BUDGET MONITORING QUARTER 2 2016/17**

#### **Decision**

1. That the budget monitoring position for each of the accounts below be noted;

#### **Resolved to Recommend:**

2. **Approval of the supplementary budgets set out below. Details for these supplementary budgets are set out in the body of the report to Cabinet and have a net nil impact on the General Fund Working Balance:**
  - **Increase the People and Performance Supplies and Services budget by £40k**
  - **Increase use of the Management of Change reserve by £40k**
  - **Increase the Community Partnerships Supplies and Services budget by £15k**

- Increase use of the Management of Change reserve by £15k
- Increase the capital budget for Disabled Facilities Grants by £133k to reflect additional grant funding received

Reason for Decision

*To provide details of the projected outturn for 2016/17 as at Quarter 2 for the:*

- *General Fund*
- *Housing Revenue Account*
- *Capital Programme*

### **Corporate Objectives**

Delivering an efficient and modern council

### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

#### **Monitoring Officer**

No further comments to add.

#### **S.151 Officer**

This is a Section 151 Officer report.

### **Advice**

Councillor Elliot confirmed that he was confident that the council would finish within budget by the year end.

Councillor Griffiths was pleased to hear we would finish within budget.

Councillor Williams noted that budgets were tight and funding received had decreased, therefore making it more difficult to balance the budgets.

### **Voting**

None.

### **CA/128/15 COUNCIL TAX BASE**

#### **Decision**

1. That the Collection Fund surplus estimate of £635,281.80 as at 31 March 2016 be approved
2. That the calculation of the Council's tax base for the year 2017/18 incorporating an estimated collection rate of 99.4% be approved

3. That, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992, the amount calculated by the Council as its tax base for the year 2017/18 shall be 56,415.4 and its constituent elements shall be:

<b>Part of Area - Parished and Non Parished</b>	<b>100% Tax base</b>	<b>99.4% Tax base</b>
Hemel Hempstead	29,923.2	29,743.7
Aldbury	455.6	452.9
Berkhamsted	8,456.3	8,405.6
Bovingdon	2,051.2	2,038.9
Chipperfield	846.7	841.6
Flamstead	613.1	609.4
Flauden	176.1	175.0
Great Gaddesden	439.9	437.3
Kings Langley	2,312.7	2,298.8
Little Gaddesden	630.6	626.8
Markyate	1,336.2	1,328.2
Nash Mills	1,160.4	1,153.4
Nettleden with Potten End	798.2	793.4
Northchurch	1,276.5	1,268.8
Tring Rural	621.9	618.2
Tring Town	4,975.6	4,945.7
Wigginton	681.8	677.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>56,756.0</b>	<b>56,415.4</b>

#### **Reason for Decision**

1. To agree the estimated Collection Fund surplus as at 31/03/2017
2. To determine the Council Tax Base for 2017/18

#### **Corporate Objectives**

Not applicable

#### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

##### **Deputy Monitoring Officer**

No further comments to add

##### **Section 151 Officer**

This is a Section 151 officer report

##### **Advice**

Councillor Elliot introduced the report and explained that it was a statutory requirement. It reported the facts and helped inform the Parishes of their precepts.

### **Voting**

None.

## **CA/129/15 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2016/17 MID-YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT**

### **Decision**

That the half-year report on targets and performance, in Sections 4-7 of the report to Cabinet be agreed.

### **Reason for Decision**

To provide Members with mid-year information on Treasury Management performance.

### **Community Impact Implications**

There are no community impact implications

### **Corporate Objectives**

Dacorum Delivers – Optimising investment income for General Fund and Housing Revenue budgets whilst managing investment risk is fundamental to achieving the corporate objectives.

### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

#### **Monitoring Officer:**

No comments to add to the report

#### **S.151 Officer**

This is a Section 151 Officer Report

### **Advice**

Councillor Elliot explained that this was a statutory report which noted that the council's return on investments were on budget.  
J Deane added that the return on council investments was currently 0.6%.

### **Voting**

None.

## **CA/130/15 RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT QUARTER 2 2016/17**

## **Decision**

That the content of this report is noted

## **Reason for Decision**

To provide the Quarter 2 update on the Strategic Risk Register

## **Corporate Objectives**

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

## **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

### **Monitoring Officer:**

No comments to add to the report.

### **Deputy S.151 Officer**

This is a Section 151 Officer report.

## **Advice**

Councillor Elliot said that this report was for quarter 2. It had previously been to the Audit Committee on the 30<sup>th</sup> of November 2016 and they scrutinised it very well. He noted that there were no concerns to be raised.

## **Voting**

None.

## **CA/131/15 THE AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT (AMR) AND LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK UPDATE**

## **Decision**

1. That the headline results from the forthcoming Authority Monitoring Report 2015/16 with regard to housing, employment and retailing be noted;
2. That progress on the Local Planning Framework be noted; and
3. That a new Local Development Scheme timetable (see Annex A) be agreed.

## **Reason for Decision**

To consider:

- the Authority Monitoring Report for 2015/16;
- progress on the Local Planning Framework; and
- agreeing a new Local Development Scheme (LDS) timetable (see Annex A).

## **Corporate Objectives**

The Authority Monitoring Report looks at the effectiveness of current planning policies – for example the achievement of the overall housing target and protection of green space/wildlife sites – and progress towards planning policy review (i.e. targets set out in the Local Development Scheme). It therefore provides a good summary of how the Council's planning policies are supporting delivery of corporate objectives – especially those relating to affordable housing; safe and clean environment and regeneration.

As the policies within the Core Strategy and other planning documents are aimed at enabling growth, it also provides an indication of how the 'Dacorum Delivers' objective is being supported.

## **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

### **Monitoring Officer:**

The Annual Monitoring Report is a requirement of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and is an important document to evidence the progress of the authority in meeting its key planning, housing and development objectives. The report demonstrates that good progress is being made on key objectives, which is positive to note.

### **Deputy S.151 Officer**

All costs incurred within 2015/16 have been recorded within the approved 2015/16 Statement of Accounts. All the costs incurred during 2016/17 will be met from within existing approved budgets. Any costs planned to be incurred during 2017/18 are being considered within the budget proposals submitted to allow approval of the budget in February 2017.

## **Advice**

Councillor Sutton introduced the report and said that the purpose was to agree the new local development scheme timetable.

J Doe added that this was an annual report to Members and this one set out the statement for the rate of development for 2015/16.

Councillor Williams said it was good to see the council exceeding its housing target as this had not been done in previous years.

## **Voting**

None.

## **CA/132/15 UPDATE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ADVICE NOTE AND SUSTAINABILITY CHECKLIST**

## **Decision**



### **Resolved to Recommend:**

- (a) The updated Sustainable Development Advice Note and associated Sustainable Development Checklist to inform Development Control decisions be adopted; and**
- (b) Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Planning, Development and Regeneration to make any necessary minor editorial changes to the Advice Note (Annex A of the report to Cabinet) and Checklist (Annex B of the report to Cabinet), prior to their final publication.**

### **Reason for Decision**

To agree an updated advice note setting out how the Council apply its policies related to sustainable development in light of the recent government policy changes.

### **Corporate Objectives**

The Sustainable Development Advice Note (alongside updated Sustainable Development Checklist) supports the 'Dacorum Delivers' and 'Clean and Safe Environment' objectives. It will improve efficiency and effectiveness of services through the provision of upfront and clear advice on the sustainable development. It also demonstrates that the Council is able to respond to changes in national policy in a prompt and effective manner. The note will continue to ensure that sustainability remain a focus for change within the borough.

### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

#### **Monitoring Officer:**

The updated Sustainable Development Advice Note will provide clarity to developers and ensure compliance with Core Strategy policies and is therefore recommended for approval.

#### **Deputy S.151 Officer:**

There are no direct financial implication so f this decision. Any resource implication in the future will need to be incorporated within the budget setting framework.

### **Advice**

Councillor Sutton introduced the report and said its purpose was to agree an updated advice note setting out how the Council applied its policies related to sustainable development in light of the recent government policy changes.

J Doe added that there were a number of changes included within the report. It set out the national situation and Dacorum's response to it. The new advice note also set out examples of good practice.

Councillor Marshall asked if there would be any impact on staff as a result of this.

J Doe said no, if anything the process had been made simpler and the new checklist had simplified the process and the system being used.

### **Voting**

None.

## **CA/133/15 DACORUM LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

### **Decision**

- 1) The post hearing letter of 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016 from the Site Allocations Planning Inspector (enclosed as Annex A to the Cabinet report) be noted;
- 2) The schedule of Main Modifications, associated changes to the Policies Map (set out in Annex B) and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Update Report (Annex C) for consultation be agreed;
- 3) Authority be delegated to the Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regeneration (in consultation with the Planning and Regeneration Portfolio Holder) to make any necessary changes to the location of the changes within the Schedules in Annex B to the Cabinet report and renumber accordingly; agree any additional minor modifications required as a result of the above and to ensure the text of the plan is up-to-date; and
- 4) Confirm arrangements for public consultation on the Main Modifications as set out in the report to Cabinet.

### **Reason for Decision**

To agree a series of Main Modifications and associated map changes to the submitted Site Allocations DPD for consultation, in order to ensure the plan can be found 'sound' following examination

### **Equalities Implications**

An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Core Strategy. Equalities issues are also picked up as part of the Sustainability Appraisal Report that accompanies the Site Allocations document.

### **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; and

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

### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

#### Monitoring Officer

The proposed main and minor modifications to Site Allocations are required to ensure that the plan can be found "sound" for adoption by the Secretary of State and are therefore recommended for further consultation.

#### Deputy Section 151 Officer

There are no direct financial implications of the recommended decisions. The costs of managing the process will be managed within existing approved budgets.

#### **Advice**

The Leader of the Council invited Councillor Guest, Gruff Edwards on behalf of Dacorum Environmental Forum and Lee Royal on behalf of West Hemel Action Group to make their statements.

#### Councillor Guest made the following statement:

Leader, Cabinet, although I and my fellow Chaulden and Warners End councillors John Whitman and Graeme Elliot voted against the release of the Local Allocations, including LA3 from the Green Belt, the decision was made. It was disappointing, but it's going to happen. The next battle is to get the infrastructure right to get the best deal for local residents, the environment and the people who will live at LA3.

The highway infrastructure needs to be right and delivered at the right time. The new houses will need new roads to serve them. I understand that the Borough Council is liaising with the County Council. Can I have the officers' word that this will continue so that residents can get to and from their own front doors? Our County Councillor Terry Douris successfully fought to prevent the cul-de-sacs in Chaulden being used for access to LA3, with the only accesses being off The Avenue and opposite the Chaulden Adventure Playground and an emergency access in Chaulden Lane. Will the officers liaise with the County Council to make sure that this happens?

A primary school is planned for the proposed development. Will the officers liaise with the County Council to make sure that this happens?

It has been said that the existing secondary schools can cope with increased numbers. Can the Borough Council liaise with the County Council to ensure that this is the case? If it turns out not to be, can the County Council provide a new secondary school.

GP provision is a concern. The Parkwood Drive practice doesn't want a branch surgery at LA3. They want to expand on the existing site because of economies of scale and being able to offer more services. Another practice is not interested in setting up at LA3. A possibility would be for Parkwood Drive to move into a super surgery at LA3. Is the Borough Council liaising with Parkwood Drive and NHS England?

Green infrastructure has to be considered. The ideas of allotments and a community orchard have been suggested. Has a park been considered? A wildlife corridor has been proposed. Is it going to be wide enough? The Council needs to work with a professional ecologist. Will there be a wildlife corridor going from Shrubhill Common to land on the other side of the development at LA3?

It is disappointing that the LA3 development is going to happen, but it's going to happen. It is a blank canvas. Let's use the right brush strokes to paint a picture, or to use a more appropriate metaphor, let's build a model that gets the infrastructure right.

Lee Royal on behalf of West Hemel Action Group made the following statement:

The West Hemel Action Group (WHAG), wish to speak on behalf of the residents of West and wider Hemel in relation to the main modifications proposed by the Planning Inspector to the DBC Site Allocations as follows:

1. Delete the Gypsy and Traveller site at LA5; and
2. Move sites LA1 and LA3 forward from Part 2 of the Housing Schedule (delivery from 2021) to Part 1 (delivery at any time following adoption of the Site Allocations DPD), to ensure we have a 5 year supply of Gypsy and Traveller pitches. On behalf of the existing residents of West Hemel WHAG submits that:

Firstly the events that have driven such modifications fly in face of fairness & good sound planning within DBC. A position has been generated that is allowing developers to drive planning, i.e. the insistence of the planned developer for LA5 that they will not move ahead if they are asked to include a G&T site. This is very much a case of the "tail wagging the dog".

Secondly, we consider that allowing one element of DBC's overall plan & one of the most negative in the eyes of the existing residents you serve, i.e. G&T site delivery, to drive the overall delivery, is far from what can be described as good planning practice.

Finally, we consider that earlier delivery of LA3, the largest of all the LAs (3) and therefore the biggest & most negatively impacting, when there are still a number of factors that require significantly more assessment and therefore more lead-in time, will lead to the worst of all outcomes for the existing and future residents of Hemel Hempstead.

We further submit that DBC should be considering the position and alternative location for the current planned LA3 G&T site, which, in every possible way, is clearly planned for a completely inappropriate position. Given the fact that the current location has no positive factors associated with it and has simply been chosen to provide the best outcome for the developers of LA3 and an easy option in terms of

planning for DBC, as opposed to thinking of the existing residents of West Hemel, i.e. those residents that you are here to work for, this may help to alleviate some of the negative impacts of LA3 and deliver a more positive outcome alongside considering other negatively impacting factors for LA3.

This is now compounded further by the fact that we now understand that DBC will not even take ownership and responsibility for any completed G&T site, therefore on the face of it, it is a case of build something that the majority of your voting public do not want, and then step away from any responsibility.

Gruff Edwards on behalf of Dacorum Environmental Forum made the following statement:

At the Examination in Public in October I made representations on behalf of the Dacorum Environmental Forum. Amongst the Inspector's questions sent out with the agenda for Matter 9 (LA3) was the one the Cabinet are now considering, which is: "Should the site come forward prior to 2021 if it is available?"

Our representation was that it should not come forward, since LA3 had obvious and exceptional environmental disadvantages, which I have summarised in a recent E-mail to some Councillors. Another Agenda question was "Should the policy reflect the developer of the site will only be required to carry out upgrading of the drainage infrastructure directly related to the site?"

Our representation on this question pointed out that about 30% of the area of LA3 drains into the western branch of the dry valley that forms Shrubhill Common, which is a Local Nature Reserve. Thus any reduction of water feeding into the valley could well have a detrimental impact on the ecosystem which is currently established there. We asked for the DPD to include a commitment that as a result of LA3 there would be no significant reduction in water draining towards the Reserve.

In response to this the speaker for Vincent Gorbing, representing the developers, said that the Water issue generally was "a very challenging matter" and a "fundamental constraint - er - matter", but that his clients were not "shirking their responsibility."

Is the Cabinet confident that the developers of the site will have enough time to address this "very challenging matter" adequately if the scheme is brought forward as proposed, and if so on what is this confidence based?

#### Questions and Answers

Councillor Williams said that we were in this position in response to the planning inspectorates report. He disagreed with the quote that it was the tail wagging the dog. He explained that if the site had been accepted in Tring, the council would not be in this position and they needed to listen to the inspectorate. The council needed to demonstrate that they are providing gypsy and traveller sites. If we don't, then someone else will provide it.

The council's role was as a planning authority and not to manage the sites, this was not to be mistaken for the council walking away from its responsibility.

J Doe responded to the points raised as follows:

- DBC are liaising with Herts Highways and will continue to as we move through each phase of the development
- The council have not changed their position with regards to accessing the site, there will remain to be 2 main principle access points
- Work is underway with the local education authority to ensure primary school provision is provided
- GP provision – the policy sets out clearly that there is to be healthcare provision at the site. NHS England and local healthcare professionals have been consulted with
- The Masterplan was making significant provision for green and open space and areas such as parks are still being considered
- A pre-application would be submitted from the developer soon and this would be publicised
- The needs of the local community needed to be assessed, but the housing need of gypsy and traveller sites needed to be addressed. 5 year provision for such sites needs to be maintained as the scheme requires
- Technical studies to support the planning application will be carried out
- If the recommendations are agreed then a consultation period will follow which anyone can contribute to
- The site would not be developed until 2021 – the housing need was pressing and a case for early delivery should not happen before 2021
- A flooding and drainage assessment has already been done and the planning application would address it

Councillor Elliot fully supported Councillor Guest's comments. He too was the relevant ward councillor and noted that their stand was already on record as voting against LA5. However as it was going ahead they must now therefore mitigate the impact. He asked if the gypsy and traveller site did not go ahead, would that increase the number of sites in LA3.

J Doe said this would not be the case and the allocated provision for LA1 and LA3 would remain the same. The council had committed to an early review of the plan which could address any concerns.

Councillor Elliot asked if gypsy and travellers would purchase pitches at commercial land price.

L Wood explained that land would be offered to market for gypsy and traveller pitches and therefore sites could be purchased. There would be a variety of mechanisms available.

Councillor Elliot asked what would happen if there were no bids for that site by travellers.

J Doe said if there were no bids received in a set amount of time then it could be revisited. He added that the local plan review would assess the needs of gypsy and traveller sites and look to the provision for the future.

Councillor Elliot referred to the two access roads and asked if the travellers could also access the site via Chaulden Lane.

J Doe said that the site was chosen due to the two access roads and will look into that part of the plan.

Councillor Harden asked how this site would have an impact on the surrounding roads and the number of potential developments. He felt that HCC should look at the overall impacts on the local traffic. He said it was interesting that HCC had reduced their responsibility for the gypsy & traveller sites at a time where the requirement for them had increased due to national legislation. He also noted that gypsy & travellers were the only group not being encouraged to integrate into the community.

Councillor Griffiths asked if there was a limit as to the length of time they can stay on one site.

J Doe said there were no restrictions and anyone occupying the site can do so for any length of time.

Councillor Marshall sympathised with the speakers and felt that the council needed to be vigilant in order to help reduce the impact. She said that the council could not ignore the advice of the planning inspectorate, if we did not comply then the whole site allocations would be put at risk. She appreciated the concerns raised but reluctantly agreed the recommendations and felt the council should go to public consultation immediately.

Councillor Sutton fully supported and appreciated the passion from the speakers and fellow councillors. He assured everyone that he was confident in the teams to be able to manage the process with consideration of the local communities. He felt that there was a very strong member led planning process which would enable this to be monitored in the future.

Councillor Griffiths said it was with a heavy heart that she would be agreeing the recommendations as she would be personally affected. She felt that there was a greater need for housing in this area which was getting higher and therefore this needs to be done in a managed way. She was concerned that if the council did not go ahead with this site, then developers could apply all over the borough and therefore it's preferable that it's contained to one area.

Councillor Williams explained that the council had to find a required number of housing provisions. He disagreed with Councillor Guest's comment that we were starting with a blank canvass, as he believed the site needed to integrate into the existing community. He said there would never be a 'good' site and therefore he felt the council needed to minimise the impact on the existing residents by locating them near new developments.

He said that gypsy and travellers is a lifestyle choice and the council were required to provide for that, and if we didn't, someone else would.

This was not a new scenario for Dacorum and had been discussing new development sites across the borough and that was the history of a developing town. DBC had to plan for this as the responsible local authority. He therefore supported the recommendations.

The committee voted on the recommendations set out in the report.

## **Voting**

For: 5

Abstain: 1 (Councillor Elliot abstained and requested that this was recorded)

## **CA/134/15 COMMITTEE TIMETABLE 2017/18**

### **Decision**

#### **Resolved to Recommend:**

- **The Meeting Timetable for 2017/18 as set out in Annex A to the Cabinet report.**

#### **Reason for Decision**

To seek approval of the Meeting Timetable for 2017/18

#### **Corporate Objectives**

The various meetings of the Council, Cabinet and Committees support the achievement of the Council's Corporate Objectives

#### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

##### **Monitoring Officer:**

No comments to add to the report

##### **Deputy S.151 Officer:**

There are no direct financial implications of the recommendations.

#### **Advice**

None

#### **Voting**

None.

## **CA/135/15 NEW BUILD PROGRAMME UPDATE**

### **Decision**

1. Progress of the Council New Build Programme be noted

#### **Resolved to Recommend:**

2. **the approval of a supplementary estimate to fund a consultancy budget of £50,000 to develop plans to build new homes on 2 garage sites at Westerdale and Northend garage sites (as detailed in the report to Cabinet, subject to securing planning permission).**

#### **Reason for Decision**



To provide a full update on the Council New Build Programme

### **Corporate Objectives**

Delivering Affordable Housing

### **Monitoring Officer/S.151 Officer Comments**

#### **Monitoring Officer:**

No comments to add to the report.

#### **Deputy S.151 Officer**

The recommendations in this report require the approval of supplementary estimate of £50k to undertake the feasibility and associated work to progress the potential garage development scheme. This can be funded through the release of Section 106 funds already held by the Council.

### **Advice**

E Brooks explained that the report was requested as a 6 monthly update. The report set out those developments already completed.

The purpose was to note progress of the Council New Build Programme and to recommend to Council, the approval of a supplementary estimate to fund a consultancy budget of £50,000 to develop plans to build new homes on 2 garage sites at Westerdale and Northend garage sites (as detailed in the report, subject to securing planning permission).

Councillor Griffiths added that the Housing & Community Overview & Scrutiny had discussed the garage sites at the recent budget meeting and members supported the proposal.

### **Voting**

None.

### **CA/136/15 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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 item in Part 2 of the Agenda for this meeting, because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that, if members of the public were present during this item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information relating to the financial and business affairs of the Council and third party companies/organisations. (Minute CA/137/16, CA/138/16, CA/139/16)

Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, Part 1, paragraph 3

### **CA/137/15 LEISURE REVIEW - REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO MANAGING LEISURE SERVICES**

Full details are in the part 2 minutes.

**CA/138/15 REVIEW OF OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE CUSTOMER SERVICES CENTRE GATEWAY (CSCG) CONTRACT.**

Full details are in the part 2 minutes.

**CA/139/15 STATIONERS PLACE, LONDON ROAD, APSLEY - AWARD OF MAIN CONTRACT TO CONSTRUCT 31 NEW FLATS FOR RENT**

Full details are in the part 2 minutes.

The Meeting ended at 9.05 pm