

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title:	Agenda																		
Date:	Tuesday 24 March 2015																		
Time:	5.00 pm																		
Venue:	Conference Chamber West (F1R09) West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds																		
Membership:	<p style="text-align: center;">Leader John Griffiths</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Deputy Leader Sara Mildmay-White</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Councillor</u></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Portfolio</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Terry Clements</td> <td>Planning and Regulation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Anne Gower</td> <td>Housing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Griffiths</td> <td>Leader</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sara Mildmay-White</td> <td>Health and Communities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alaric Pugh</td> <td>Economic Growth</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dave Ray</td> <td>Resources and Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sarah Stamp</td> <td>Leisure, Culture and Heritage</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peter Stevens</td> <td>Waste and Property</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>	Terry Clements	Planning and Regulation	Anne Gower	Housing	John Griffiths	Leader	Sara Mildmay-White	Health and Communities	Alaric Pugh	Economic Growth	Dave Ray	Resources and Performance	Sarah Stamp	Leisure, Culture and Heritage	Peter Stevens	Waste and Property
<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>																		
Terry Clements	Planning and Regulation																		
Anne Gower	Housing																		
John Griffiths	Leader																		
Sara Mildmay-White	Health and Communities																		
Alaric Pugh	Economic Growth																		
Dave Ray	Resources and Performance																		
Sarah Stamp	Leisure, Culture and Heritage																		
Peter Stevens	Waste and Property																		
Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:	Members are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest not entered in the Authority's register or local non pecuniary interest which they have in any item of business on the agenda (subject to the exception for sensitive information) and to leave the meeting prior to discussion and voting on an item in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.																		
Quorum:	Three Members																		
Committee administrator:	Claire Skoyles SEBC Cabinet Officer/Committee Administrator Tel: 01284 757176 Email: claire.skoyles@westsuffolk.gov.uk																		

Agenda

Page No

Procedural Matters

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Minutes

1 - 24

To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 10 February 2015 and 24 February 2015 (Special Meeting) (copies attached).

Part 1 - Public

3. Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 12 March 2015

25 - 28

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/020**

Chairman: Ian Houlder

Lead Officer: Christine Brain

4. Eastern Relief Road, Bury St Edmunds: Update

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/021 TO FOLLOW**

Cabinet Member: John Griffiths

Lead Officer: Andrea Mayley

5. Transfer of Land to Suffolk County Council for New High School at Moreton Hall, Bury St Edmunds

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/022 TO FOLLOW**

Cabinet Member: Peter Stevens

Lead Officer: Richard Combes

6. Public Service Village Phase II: Update and Next Phase

29 - 36

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/023**

Cabinet Member: John Griffiths

Lead Officer: Steven Wood

7. Leisure Development Proposals for West Stow Country Park: Update

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/024 TO FOLLOW**

Cabinet Member: Sarah Stamp

Lead Officer: Richard Hartley

8. Sponsorship and Advertising Policy for West Suffolk

37 - 46

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/025**

Cabinet Member: David Ray

Lead Officer: Richard Hartley

9. West Suffolk Safeguarding Policy

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/026 TO FOLLOW**

Cabinet Member: Sara Mildmay-White

Lead Officer: Simon Phelan

10. Recommendations from the Bury St Edmunds Area Working Party: 10 March 2015 **47 - 50**

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/027**

Cabinet Member: Terry Clements Lead Officer: Christine Leveson

(a) Amendments to the Article 4 Directions in Bury St Edmunds Town Centre and Victoria Street Conservation Areas

11. Recommendations from the Grant Working Party: 13 March 2015 **51 - 56**

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/028**

Cabinet Member: Sara Mildmay-White Lead Officer: Davina Howes

(a) New approach to grant funding arrangements and review of the Locality Budget Scheme

12. Revenues Collection Performance and Write-Offs **57 - 60**

Report No: **CAB/SE/15/029**

Cabinet Member: David Ray Lead Officer: Rachael Mann

13. Exclusion of Press and Public

To consider whether the press and public should be excluded during the consideration of the following items because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the items, there would be disclosure to them of exempt categories of information as prescribed in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, and indicated against each item and, in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Part 2 - Exempt

14. Exempt Appendices: Revenues Collection Performance and Write-offs **61 - 64**

Exempt Appendices to Report No: **CAB/SE/15/029**

Cabinet Member: David Ray Lead Officer: Rachael Mann

(These exempt appendices are to be considered in private under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as they contain information relating to an individual and information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.)

(No representations have been received from members of the public regarding this item being held in private.)

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Cabinet** held on
Tuesday 10 February 2015 at 5.00 pm in the **Conference Chamber West,**
West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman Sara Mildmay-White (Deputy Leader of the Council)
(in the Chair)

Terry Clements
Anne Gower
Alaric Pugh

Dave Ray
Sarah Stamp
Peter Stevens

By Sarah Broughton,
Invitation: Ian Houlder and
David Nettleton

(Chairman of the Performance and Audit
Scrutiny Committee)

(Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny
Committee)

In
attendance: David Nettleton

23. **Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from John Griffiths.

24. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

25. **Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 17 December 2014**

The Cabinet received and noted Report No: CAB/SE/15/001 (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 December 2014:

- (1) Car Park Tariffs 2015/2016;
- (2) Decisions Plan: December 2014 to May 2015; and
- (4) Work Programme Update and Suggestions for Scrutiny.

Councillor Houlder, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that issues emanating from the discussion on Item (1) above had been included within a

separate report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee for consideration next on the Cabinet agenda (Report No: CAB/SE/15/002 AMENDED refers).

He added that a date of 16 April 2015 had been set for a Member Learning and Development Session to cover the following topics, both of which had been subjects of proposed suggestions for scrutiny but had been considered by the Committee that a more suitable approach would be to be address both issues in this manner:

- (a) Shared Services model and corporate working practices; and
- (b) Leader and Cabinet model.

26. **Report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 29 January 2015**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/002 (AMENDED) (previously circulated) which informed the Cabinet of the following items discussed by the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee on 29 January 2015:

- (1) Key Performance Indicators and Quarter Three Performance Report 2014/2015;
- (2) West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register Quarterly Monitoring Report – December 2014;
- (3) Work Programme Update;
- (4) Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) Quarter 3 – 2014/2015;
- (5) Delivering a Sustainable Budget 2015/2016 Update;
- (6) Treasury Management Report 2014/2015 Investment Activity 1 April – 31 December 2014;
- (7) Annual Treasury Management and Investment Strategy Statements 2015/2016; and
- (8) Update on Procurement Exercise for External Fund Manager to Support Treasury Management Activities.

Councillor Mrs Broughton, Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that the Committee had informally considered the first three items listed above jointly with Forest Heath District Council's Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee.

The Cabinet was informed that separate reports relating to Items (7) and (8) above were included on the Cabinet agenda as these required separate consideration of the recommendations provided. In addition, a recommendation relating to car park tariffs for 2015/2016, which was considered as part of item (5) above was detailed in Report No: CAB/SE/15/002. This recommendation was subsequently revised and included in the amended version of the report.

It was explained at the meeting that the bold underlined text in italics in the amended version of the report had been added to assist the Cabinet in its own decision-making on the findings of both scrutiny committees in respect of car parking (which were presented as a formal recommendation to Cabinet

only once, under this item on the agenda). The proposed amendment reflected the information which had been considered and noted by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in December 2014, and was now necessary in order to seek authority from Cabinet to bring those matters into effect through a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), subject to the satisfactory outcome of the statutory 28 day consultation. However, it was confirmed that this specific aspect of the car parking review had not actually been considered by the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee itself. That Committee had only examined and endorsed the car parking proposals insofar as they affected the draft budget, a fact which would be reflected in the minutes of its meeting.

A discussion was then held on Paragraph 1.94 of the report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding Car Park Tariffs 2015/2016 and the associated proposals to make changes to the TRO (Report No: OAS/SE/14/001 refers). Paragraph 1.9.4 had sought to introduce a low emission car park and vehicle tariff on the Old Sale Yard (Rose and Crown PH) car park in Haverhill. However, Councillor Mrs Gower, Portfolio Holder with the responsibility for Haverhill, considered this proposal warranted further investigation as part of the full review of car parking currently scheduled to be held in June 2015.

As there were no budget implications as a result of removing this proposal from the recommended changes to the TRO, it was agreed to accept Councillor Mrs Gower's suggestion.

RESOLVED:

That the car park tariffs for 2015/2016, as set out in Paragraph 1.3.2 of Report No: PAS/SE/15/005 and the amendments outlined to the Borough of St Edmundsbury (Off Street Parking Places) Order 2010, as set out in Paragraph 1.9 of Report No: OAS/SE/14/001, be approved as part of the budget setting process for 2015/2016, subject to the exclusion of the proposal outlined in Paragraph 1.9.4 of Report No: OAS/SE/14/001 and the satisfactory outcome of consultation with local residents on the remaining amendments to the Order.

27. **Recommendation of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee:
29 January 2015: Annual Treasury Management and Investment
Strategy Statements 2015/2016**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/003 (previously circulated), which sought approval for the Annual Treasury Management and Investment Strategy Statements for 2015/2016.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management required that, prior to the start of the financial year, the Council formally approved an Annual Treasury Management and Investment Strategy, setting out the Council's treasury management policy and strategy statements for the forthcoming year.

Councillor Ray, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that the potential implications of changes to credit ratings calculated by rating agencies as a result of the implied removal of sovereign support to banks needed to be assessed. The Cabinet therefore considered it prudent to accept the second recommendation proposed by Councillor Ray, as detailed in the recommendation to full Council below.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

That:

- (1) the Annual Treasury Management and Investment Strategy Statements 2015/2016, as contained in Appendix 1 to Report TMS/SE/15/002, be adopted; and**
- (2) the Head of Resources and Performance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance and the Chairman of Treasury Management Sub-Committee, be given delegated authority to make amendments to the Treasury Management Investment Strategy, taking into account advice of the Council's Treasury Management Advisors in response to changes to credit ratings resulting from the implied removal of sovereign support in the Bank of England's 'bail-in' regulations.**

(Councillor Houlder left the meeting during the consideration of this item.)

28. Recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 29 January 2015 - Update on Procurement Exercise for External Fund Manager to Support Treasury Management Activities

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/14/004 (previously circulated), which sought approval for a preferred option relating to the timing for undertaking a procurement exercise for the appointment and use of an external fund manager.

Councillor Ray, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that following Cabinet's approval of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee's recommendation in November 2013, to use both Treasury Management Advisors and External Fund Managers, Report No: CAB/SE/15/004 summarised two potential options on the timing for a procurement exercise for appointment and use of an External Fund Manager, as detailed in Report No: TMS/SE/15/003.

On the recommendation of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, the Cabinet considered Option B was the most appropriate, which was as follows:

'A procurement exercise commences during the summer of 2015, allowing for further opportunity to consider the business cases for some potentially significant investment opportunities such as Public Sector Village II, Waste Transfer Site and Investing in Housing within the Borough and the Council's overall spending plans.'

RESOLVED:

That Option B, as detailed in paragraph 1.2.1 of Report TMS/SE/15/003, be approved.

29. **Budget and Council Tax Setting: 2015/2016 and Medium Term Financial Strategy**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/005 (previously circulated), which presented the proposals for Budget and Council Tax Setting in 2015/2016.

Councillor Ray, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that Report No: CAB/SE/15/005 set out details of the Council's proposed revenue and capital budgets for 2015/2016 and the Cabinet was required to consider the 2015/2016 budget for the authority and recommend to Council the level of Council Tax required to fund this budget.

The Finance Team was commended for delivering a sustainable budget for 2015/2016. Staff were also recognised for showing dedication and commitment in making the Council more efficient in delivering the necessary savings whilst maintaining the delivery of services.

It was also acknowledged that by 2018/2019, the projected budget gap amounted to £2.5million for St Edmundsbury, as set out in the adopted Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). Six themes contained within the MTFS and summarised in Section 2.3 of the report, related to areas of the West Suffolk councils' business which would support sustainability in a more financially constrained environment, which included continuing the shared services agenda and behaving more commercially.

The Cabinet supported the proposal for maintaining the same level of Council Tax as 2014/2015, which meant there had been no increase in Council Tax for the fifth consecutive year and for six out of the last seven years. With costs rising and all the other changes and pressures on the Council, the Cabinet considered this to be a tremendous achievement whilst maintaining the provision of excellent services for the residents of the Borough. Members also supported the proposal in connection with the business rates transitional relief 2015/2016 to 2016/2017, as detailed in paragraphs 1.4.3 to 1.4.7 of the report.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

That:

- (1) the revenue and capital budget for 2015/2016 attached at Attachment A to Report No: CAB/SE/15/005, and as detailed in Attachment D, Appendix 1-5 and Attachment E be approved;**

- (2) having taken into account the conclusions of the Head of Resources and Performance's report on the adequacy of reserves and the robustness of budget estimates (Attachment C) and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) (Attachment D), particularly the Scenario Planning and Sensitivity Analysis (Attachment D and Appendix 5) and all other information contained in this report, Cabinet recommends a 0% increase in council tax for 2015/2016;**
- (3) the Head of Resources and Performance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance, be authorised to transfer any surplus from the 2014/2015 revenue budget to the Invest to Save Reserve as detailed in paragraph 1.8.4, and to vire funds between existing Earmarked Reserves (as set out at Attachment D, Appendix 3) as deemed appropriate throughout the year; and**
- (4) that the use of the Council's discretionary power (S47 Local Government Finance Act) to provide the transitional relief be approved and delegated authority be given to the Head of Resources and Performance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance, to determine the final guidelines for the operation of the transitional relief for 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 following the current scheme and guidance issued by Government (Attachment F), as set out in paragraphs 1.4.3 to 1.4.7 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/005.**

30. Suffolk Business Park Land Assembly

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/006 (previously circulated), which sought approval for the principle of exercising the Council's compulsory purchase powers to help facilitate the development of Suffolk Business Park, Bury St Edmunds.

Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White, Deputy Leader of the Council, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that planning permission for the Eastern Relief Road (ERR) had been granted, which would provide a new link from the A14 trunk road to Moreton Hall and the Suffolk Business Park. The Relief Road was an important piece of infrastructure designed to help relieve congestion at junctions 43 and 44 of the A14 that currently served Moreton Hall and Suffolk Business Park.

The 68 hectare extension to Suffolk Business Park and further housing growth on the Moreton Hall Estate was in three ownerships – Taylor Wimpey, the Borough Council and Rougham Estates. Rougham Estates was represented by an agent, Churchmanor. The land in control of Churchmanor was now the only parcel of land needed to complete the ERR and extension to Suffolk Business Park, however, negotiations with Churchmanor and the Council had currently stalled. It was therefore now concerning that unless the Council considered the use of its powers and approved the making of a Compulsory Purchase Order, the current impasse would continue indefinitely, further delaying this important scheme and thereby failing to provide much needed housing, education, community and employment land.

At this stage, the Cabinet was required to consider whether the Head of Planning and Growth should be authorised to continue exploring options with the landowners which would resolve the matter without needing to invoke its compulsory purchase powers. Should negotiations be unsuccessful however, a further report would be brought back to Cabinet and full Council to progress the use of its CPO powers.

The Cabinet fully supported the recommendations as detailed in the decision below.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (1) the principle of using the Council's compulsory purchase powers (CPO) under section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to acquire such estates and interest in the land as may be necessary to facilitate the development of the Eastern Relief Road and Suffolk Business Park in accordance with the local development plan, as detailed in Section 2 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/006, be approved; and
- (2) the Head of Planning and Growth be authorised to continue to explore options with the landowners which would resolve the matter without the need for the Council to invoke its compulsory purchase powers. In the event of negotiations proving unsuccessful, a further report will be brought to a future Cabinet meeting to seek a recommendation to Council for use of CPO powers in accordance with recommendation 1 above.

31. **Grant Funding 2015/2016: Arts and Sports Revenue Support Grants**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/007 (previously circulated), which sought approval for revenue support grants for arts and sports organisations.

Councillor Mrs Stamp, Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Heritage drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that the Council had traditionally supported Smith's Row Art Gallery and the Theatre Royal, Bury St Edmunds with revenue grant funding. The Council had suffered significant funding cuts over the last few years, and as funding became tighter, the requirement to ensure the Council was getting value for money had become even more imperative.

The report provided details of how the Council had met with each organisation to establish an appropriate way forward. The Theatre Royal had been informed that it was to receive a cut in Arts Council England funding with effect from April 2015. The Theatre had responded positively to this with better, more commercial programming that attracted larger audiences, and efforts made to reach out into the community. Work was being undertaken to ascertain whether the Theatre and The Apex could benefit from greater

partnership working. In the meantime, it was proposed that the Theatre's grant should be reduced by £5,000 to £66,250 in 2015/2016 with the aim of working more closely with them in future years to look at reducing this grant further.

Having taken into account a number of factors as summarised in the report, it was proposed that Smith's Row should receive a 25% reduction in its current Borough Council funding of £34,485 to £25,000 in 2015/2016 with a view to withdrawing funding completely from 2016. Some of the £25,000 previously granted to Smith's Row would then be allocated to other visual art projects in Borough which supported the Council's strategic priorities around economic growth and families and communities.

In respect of the Victory Sports Ground, Bury St Edmunds, it was proposed that as the opening of the community sports facility at the Sports Ground was a relatively new venture, further support was required from the Council's strategic sports partner, Abbeycroft Leisure to help them look at commercial opportunities and make the facility more independently financially viable. It was therefore proposed that in 2015/2016, the Victory Sports Ground would receive a reduction in grant of £2,500 to £45,250 with a view to reducing this grant to zero within a number of years, as previously agreed by Cabinet.

On 12 January 2015, the Grant Working Party had considered and endorsed these proposals.

RESOLVED:

That the following levels of funding be approved and included in the budget for 2015/2016, as detailed in Report No: CAB/SE/15/007:

- (1) Theatre Royal, Bury St Edmunds: £66,250 (a reduction of £5,000);
- (2) Smith's Row Art Gallery, Bury St Edmunds: £25,000 (a reduction of £9,485); and
- (3) Victory Ground Sports Ground, Bury St Edmunds: £45,250 (a reduction of £2,500).

32. **West Suffolk Homelessness Strategy 2015-2018**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/008 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the West Suffolk Homelessness Strategy 2015-2018.

Councillor Mrs Gower, Portfolio Holder for Housing, informed the Cabinet that the Homelessness Act 2002 required all councils to produce a Homelessness Strategy at least every five years. Section 1.2 of the report outlined the issues that were required to be considered within the Strategy. The West Suffolk Homelessness Strategy set out how St Edmundsbury Borough and Forest Heath District Councils, along with their partners, would address and prevent homelessness over the next three years, ensuring that there was

sufficient suitable temporary accommodation and support for those who were homeless or threatened with homelessness.

The Strategy, which had been subject to a period of stakeholder and public consultation, supported and complemented the recently adopted West Suffolk Housing Strategy and was fully endorsed by the Cabinet. The Housing team were commended for their work on the document, with particular recognition given to the Housing Options Manager.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

That the West Suffolk Homelessness Strategy 2015-2018, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: CAB/SE/15/008, be adopted.

33. West Suffolk Equality Scheme 2015-2020

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/009 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the West Suffolk Equality Scheme 2015-2020.

Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White, Portfolio Holder with the responsibility for equality and diversity, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. She explained that both St Edmundsbury Borough and Forest Heath District Councils' existing schemes were due to be updated and the opportunity had been taken to develop one single scheme for West Suffolk. This scheme, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, had been produced having regard to The Equalities Act 2010, the Public Sector Equalities Duty and the guidance provided by the Equalities and Human Rights Commission. It set out how the Council would manage and monitor equality, as an employer, as a service provider and in its role as local authority.

Appendix 2 provided a template and guidance which set out a two stage approach. The first stage involved completing an equality screening assessment. The second stage of a full Equality Impact Assessment was a natural progression from the screening stage if there remained significant uncertainties about the levels of impact on one or more of the identified diversity groups.

A discussion was held on appropriate training for staff and Members on equality and diversity issues. The Cabinet was informed that together with an e-learning package which was available for staff and councillors to complete, new and re-elected Members would be encouraged to attend a Member Development Session on this issue, as part of the forthcoming post-election induction programme.

RESOLVED:

That the West Suffolk Equality Scheme 2015-2020 at Appendix 1 to Report No: CAB/SE/15/009 and the Equality Guidance and Forms at Appendix 2, be approved.

34. **West Suffolk Pension Discretions Policy**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/010 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the Pension Discretions Policy.

Councillor Ray, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance informed the Cabinet that The Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) changed to a career average ('CARE' – career average revalued earnings) scheme in April 2014. The new pension regulations gave employers a number of discretionary options. The Council was required to agree and publish its decisions in relation to these discretions in a written Statement of Policy.

Appendix A attached to the report contained the Policy, with a summary of the recommended discretions contained in Appendix B.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the Pension Discretions Policy, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: CAB/SE/15/010, be approved.

35. **Report from the Anglia Revenues and Benefits Joint Committee: 11 December 2014**

The Cabinet received and noted (previously circulated) which provided an outline of the issues discussed by the Anglia Revenues and Benefits Partnership Joint Committee at its meeting held on 11 December 2014.

On 11 December 2014, the Anglia Revenues and Benefits Partnership Joint Committee considered the following substantive items of business:

- (1) Fraud;
- (2) Performance Report;
- (3) ARP Partnership Budget 2015/2016;
- (4) ARP Risk Register;
- (5) Strategic Review; and
- (6) Welfare Reform.

Councillor Ray, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet.

36. **Recommendations from the Rural Area Working Party: 26 January 2015**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/012 (previously circulated) which sought approval for recommendations emanating from the meeting of the Rural Area Working Party held on 26 January 2015.

On 26 January 2015, the Rural Area Working Party considered the following substantive items of business:

- (1) St Edmundsbury's Rural Youth Work Project 2015;
- (2) Rural Public Transport;

- (3) Funding of Rural Local Authorities;
- (4) Parish Conference: Thursday 26 March 2015; and
- (5) Work Programme.

Councillor Stevens, Portfolio Holder with the responsibility for rural issues, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that a review of the rural youth work programme was considered to be required for implementation in 2016/2017 so that it better complemented the Families and Communities Strategy and the work of locality officers. In relation to the use of the 'On the Spot' vehicle in 2015, it was also considered further negotiation was required with the YMCA regarding the possible introduction of a transitional programme, as suggested by the Working Party.

Discussion was then held on the recommendation emanating from Item (3) above. It was noted that residents in urban areas currently received £178 more per head each year in government funding for council services than those in rural areas, a gap which would not be closed by government proposals for 2015/2016. Whilst it had also been noted that the Council had already highlighted this disparity in its response to the Government's consultation on the provisional finance settlement in January 2015, the Cabinet supported the Working Party's proposal to carry out further lobbying and awareness raising.

(a) St Edmundsbury's Rural Youth Work Project 2015

RESOLVED:

That:

- (1) the Council's existing funding of £10,600 for rural youth programmes, as outlined in paragraph 1.1.3 of Report No: RUR/SE/15/001, continue to be ring-fenced for that purpose within any new wider approach to grants and commissioning, and underspends in that budget in any year be rolled forward as appropriate;
- (2) a review of the delivery and funding of the rural youth programme be carried out for implementation in 2016, with a view to enabling rural communities to provide sustainable and locally-led youth initiatives in their villages;
- (3) for 2015, the officers negotiate with the Suffolk YMCA to provide a transitional programme using the On the Spot Vehicle, taking into account the steer of the Rural Area Working Party at its meeting on 26 January 2015, and with the final detail to be approved in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder.

(b) Funding of Rural Local Authorities

RESOLVED:

That, supporting the work of the Rural Services Network and SPARSE, the Council raises its concerns regarding the relative under-funding of rural local authorities with its Members of Parliament.

**37. Recommendations from the Sustainable Development Working Party:
28 January 2015**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/013 (previously circulated) which sought approval for recommendations emanating from the meeting of the Sustainable Development Working Party held on 28 January 2015.

On 28 January 2015, the Sustainable Development Working Party considered the following substantive items of business:

- (1) Joint Development Management Policies Document – Planning Inspector’s Report and Adoption;
- (2) Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham Development Brief; and
- (3) West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide Consultation Responses and Adoption.

Councillor Clements, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that the recommendations emanating from the consideration of the Joint Development Management Policies Document referred to in Item (1) above would be considered by the Joint Development Management Policies Committee and its recommendations would subsequently be considered directly by full Council on 24 February 2015.

On consideration of the Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham Development Brief, the Working Party had expressed a number of concerns with its current form, including:

- (a) that the Core Strategy ‘Local Service Centre’ allocation for Great Whelnetham envisaged small developments of around ten dwellings per site. This was considered to be one such site and the capacity of 63 dwellings proposed was too many given the constraints;
- (b) such constraints identified were: part of the site was in a conservation area; potential flooding from surface water run-off; the proximity of the adjacent sewage treatment works; the topography of the site and its associated difficulties; the close relationship to existing dwellings; and the potential impact on the sensitive rural landscape and a nearby protected rookery.

Given the above concerns, as detailed further in the report and minutes of the Working Party meeting, the recommendation not to support adoption of the Development Brief in its current form was supported.

Once adopted, the West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide would be a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and would provide detailed guidance on the design of new and replacement shop fronts throughout West Suffolk. The guidance covered matters such as general design principles; materials and colour; signage and lighting; blinds and canopies; and security measures for retail and other commercial properties. The document had been subject to public consultation and the comments were summarised in the report considered by the Working Party

(SDW/SE/15/003 refers). The Cabinet commended its thoroughness and content.

(a) Erskine Lodge, Gt Whelnetham Development Brief

RESOLVED:

That the Development Brief for Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham in its current form, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/002, be NOT adopted; and

(b) West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:

That:

- (1) the West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide with suggested amendments, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/003 be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document subject to it being noted in the Glossary on page 28 in respect of the second item 'Building of Local Interest', reference to 'Birmingham' be deleted and 'the areas' inserted therefor; and**
- (2) the Head of Planning and Growth be given delegated authority to edit/insert appropriate images as part of the final document publishing process.**

38. Exemption to Contract Procedure Rules

The Cabinet received and noted a narrative item which provided an exemption to the Contract Procedure Rules of the Constitution, relating to the procurement of replacement flooring for Haverhill Leisure Centre's sports hall flooring system.

Section 4.3 of the Contract Procedure Rules stated that: *Between £50,001 and the EU Threshold any exemption must be approved by the Officer and Head of Service in consultation with the Head of Resources and Performance. The Officer must produce evidence to support the request for any exemption. The Head of Service shall prepare a report for the next Cabinet to support the action taken. The exemption, being a Contracting Decision, the reason for it (together with support evidence) shall be forwarded to the Head of Resources and Performance.*

This exemption was exercised on 23 December 2014 for a contract to 4 Runner Ltd valued at £52,275 for the urgent replacement of flooring to the sports hall at Haverhill Leisure Centre. The semi-sprung floor system has failed and is rapidly deteriorating requiring urgent replacement to protect the safety of sports hall users.

The exemption was made on the basis that there was:

- (a) an unforeseeable emergency involving immediate risk to persons or property, or serious disruption to council services; and
- (b) unforeseen works where delay will adversely impact on the service delivery of the council.

The exemption was duly noted by the Cabinet.

39. **Revenues Collection Performance and Write-Offs**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/014 (previously circulated) which provided the collection data in respect of Council Tax and National Non-Domestic Rates and sought approval for the write-off of debts as contained in the Exempt Appendices.

Councillor Ray, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet, including that following the publication of the report, updated collection rate figures could now be provided. As at 31 January 2015, the collection rate of National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR) was 92.56% against a profiled target of 92.62%. As at 31 January 2015, the Council Tax collection rate was 95.67% against a profiled target of 96.46%

The Revenues Section collected outstanding debts in accordance with either statutory guidelines or Council agreed procedures. When all these procedures had been exhausted the outstanding debt was written off using the delegated authority of the Head of Resources and Performance (for debts up to £2,499.99) or by Cabinet (for debts over £2,500).

The specific reasons for recommending each write-off were included in Exempt Appendices 1, 2 and 3.

RESOLVED:

That the write-off of the amounts detailed in the exempt appendices to Report No: CAB/SE/15/014, be approved, as follows:

Exempt Appendix 1:	Council Tax totalling £5,363.83
Exempt Appendix 2:	Business Rates totalling £4,727.56
Exempt Appendix 3:	Housing Benefit Overpayments £6,991.65

40. **West Suffolk Operational Hub**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/015 (previously circulated) which sought approval for proceeding with the next stage of the West Suffolk Operational Hub project.

Councillor Mrs Mildmay-White, Deputy Leader of the Council, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. She explained that the proposed development of a West Suffolk Operational Hub at Hollow Road Farm, Bury St Edmunds would be one of a number of important public sector estate projects in Suffolk.

A new facility at Hollow Road Farm, which could potentially include provision of a new Waste Transfer Station and Household Waste Recycling Centre for West Suffolk, would mean that immediate efficiency gains could be realised by all parties and new commercial opportunities explored.

The relocation of waste services into this new facility would also enable a series of exciting new developments to be completed on the vacated land. This would include the second phase of the ambitious Public Sector Village (PSV) in Bury St Edmunds, which in turn could potentially allow other sites in West Suffolk to be vacated and put to better use.

This programme sought to identify opportunities for shared use of public sector facilities. Bringing services from different partners together on to the same site and sharing costs (co-location) would give better value for taxpayers and better services for residents and businesses through efficiencies which came from more joined-up working. This reorganisation would make better use of assets; ensuring modern, efficient facilities with room for growth to be available for the future with a minimum overall cost to taxpayers.

Report No: CAB/SE/15/015 provided an update on the current anticipated costs and benefits and asked that the next stage of the project regarding the starting of planning application process, which was also dependent on Forest Heath and Suffolk County Councils' approval, to be formally commenced. During this next phase, options for capital funding would also be reviewed which would include funds from other related projects (such as PSV Phase Two) and consideration of financing options. Approval to fully proceed with the project would be required by Cabinet and full Council at a later stage.

A detailed discussion was held and the Cabinet was pleased to note that Suffolk County and Forest Heath District Councils' Cabinets appeared to be supportive of the principles of the proposed scheme and it was encouraging that there seemed to be a tremendous will from all parties to bring this project to fruition.

Members were also encouraged that a holistic approach to the project was being taken with capacity for the site expected to be sufficient for the next 10 to 20 years.

Councillor Mrs Broughton, neighbouring Ward Member for the site, was in attendance and wished to speak on matters provided in the Exempt Appendices.

Therefore at this point, it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

Such matters included:

- (a) the length of the consultation period during the proposed pre-planning application stage;
- (b) provision of sufficient consultation sessions with neighbouring parish councils and the public;
- (c) proposed access and egress to the site; and
- (d) potential traffic implications during both the site's development and upon completion.

Issues (c) and (d) above and more would be considered during the pre-planning application stage and interested parties would have the opportunity to submit their comments during the consultation.

Following consideration in private session, the Cabinet concluded its discussion in public.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (1) the contents of Report No: CAB/SE/15/015 be noted; and
- (2) the next stage of the project be agreed to proceed which will be to seek planning consent for a West Suffolk Operational Hub at Hollow Road Farm, Bury St Edmunds.

41. Exclusion of Press and Public

Referred to under Minute 40 above.

42. Exempt Appendices: West Suffolk Operational Hub

The Cabinet considered Exempt Appendices A and B to Report No: CAB/SE/15/015 (previously circulated) in private session.

43. Exempt Appendices: Revenues Collection Performance and Write Offs

The Cabinet considered Exempt Appendices 1, 2 and 3 to Report No: CAB/SE/15/014 (previously circulated), however no reference was made to specific detail and therefore this item was not held in private session.

44. Exempt Minutes: 2 December 2014

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The meeting concluded at 6.45 pm

Signed by:

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Special Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a special meeting of the **Cabinet** held on
Tuesday 24 February 2015 at 4.45 pm at the **GFR14, West Suffolk**
House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman John Griffiths (Leader of the Council)

Vice Chairman Sara Mildmay-White (Deputy Leader of the Council)

Terry Clements

Anne Gower

Alaric Pugh

Dave Ray

Sarah Stamp

Peter Stevens

By Robert Everitt
Invitation:

In
attendance: David Nettleton

45. **Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received.

46. **Suffolk Business Park Land Assembly**

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/016 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the making of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and associated issues.

Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He reminded Members that on 10 February 2015, Cabinet approved in principle, the use of the Council's compulsory purchase powers in relation to the land shown on the plan attached as Appendix 1 to the report. This was because negotiations between the Council, Churchmanor Estates Company PLC and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd had currently stalled and the land in control of Churchmanor, as agents acting on behalf Rougham Estates, was now the only parcel of land needed to complete the Eastern Relief Road and extension to Suffolk Business Park.

Appropriate attempts to resolve the matter by negotiation had been made to avoid the use of these statutory powers. These discussions with Churchmanor had not to date resulted in a satisfactory resolution to provide the Council

with confidence that the site land assembly would happen without the Council using its compulsory purchase powers.

The costs associated with making the Order fell into two general categories; costs incurred during the process of making the Order and costs relating to the acquisition of the land should the Order be invoked. The Council was in the process of agreeing a mechanism for the cost associated with making the Order to be covered and the options were further expanded upon in the report.

The Cabinet noted that correspondence had been received that morning from CMS lawyers acting on behalf of Churchmanor, in response to the proposed CPO process. The letter and officers' comments would be circulated to Members following the meeting. A meeting between representatives of Churchmanor and the Council had been arranged for the next morning to discuss the matter. The outcome of this, including the response to the letter would be considered before final approval of the recommendations was sought from full Council.

A detailed discussion was held and Members considered that they hoped meaningful negotiations would continue to enable a satisfactory conclusion to be achieved for all concerned. All were in agreement that the entire project in this location needed to come to fruition – the secondary school, the extension to Suffolk Business Park, housing, infrastructure etc and in order to achieve that, this final parcel of land was required.

The Cabinet considered that if it did not seek to use its compulsory purchase powers, this would result in the Eastern Relief Road (ERR) not progressing and funding falling away. Should attempts to resolve the matter by negotiation continue to be unsuccessful, the recommendations would be recommended for approval by full Council at a special meeting on 25 March 2015.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL: That

- (1) it makes the St Edmundsbury Borough Council (Suffolk Business Park Infrastructure) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015 ("the Order") under section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 and section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and all other enabling powers, for the acquisition of all legal estates and interests in the land and the acquisition of rights within the areas shown hatched on the draft Order map produced as Appendix 1 to Report No: CAB/SE/15/016 with such amendment to the final land take and plot boundaries and to substitute the taking of new rights as an alternative to the acquisition of title as may be considered necessary and approved by the Head of Planning and Growth, the Section 151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, for the purposes of securing mixed use development including the provision of the Eastern Relief Road linking Moreton Hall/Suffolk Business Park at Lady Miriam Way to Junction 45 of the A14 Trunk Road;**

- (2) it notes that the draft Order map shows areas hatched where the intention is for the acquisition of all interests in the land other than those of the acquiring authority;**
- (3) following confirmation of the Order by the Secretary of State, it authorises the use of the General Vesting Declaration procedure and notice to treat, notice of entry and conveyance where necessary in accordance with the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 and the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 to implement the St Edmundsbury Borough Council (Suffolk Business Park Infrastructure) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015;**
- (4) it approves the acquisition and appropriation of the land required for the scheme for planning purposes under the provisions of section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 and section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in conjunction with (3) above to enable the Council to over-ride private rights, easements and interests (including restrictive covenants etc) affecting the land required for the scheme;**
- (5) it gives delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Growth and Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council to:**
 - (i) take all necessary steps as soon as is reasonably practical to secure the making, submission, confirmation and implementation of the Order (and, where appropriate, amendments to the Order by way of exclusion of interests in land or the addition of interests in land including the investigation of ownership interests) including the publication and service of all notices and the presentation of the Council's case at any Public Inquiry; and subsequent services of Notices to Treat and Notices of Entry or, at their discretion, the execution of General Vesting Declarations as the case may be if the Order is confirmed;**
 - (ii) negotiate to acquire all interests in the land and new rights within the Order and rights and interests affected by the Order either by agreement or compulsorily, including prior to the making of the Order; and, where appropriate, to agree terms for relocation;**
 - (iii) approve agreements and undertakings with the owners of any interest in the Order and any objectors to the confirmation of the Order setting out the terms for the withdrawal of objections to the Order including, where appropriate, seeking inclusion in and/or exclusion from the Order of land or new rights; and**
 - (iv) in the event that the question of compensation be referred to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), to take all necessary steps in relation thereto including advising on the appropriate**

compensation payable and to appoint appropriate consultants if necessary to assist and advise in this regard.

47. Eastern Relief Road, Bury St Edmunds: Update

The Cabinet considered Report No: CAB/SE/15/017 (previously circulated) which sought approval for a number of issues connected with progressing the development of the Eastern Relief Road and Suffolk Business Park.

Members were firstly informed of a typographical error within the table contained in paragraph 4.1 of the report. Item 3 made reference to a report marked with an asterisk – this report was CAB/SE/15/016, as previously considered on this Cabinet agenda.

Councillor Griffiths, Leader of the Council, drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet. He stated that:

- (a) a commitment was sought to forward fund electricity costs to serve Suffolk Business Park of up to £4,528,871, including making an immediate financial allocation of £356,186;
- (b) delegated authority was sought to be given to enter into the necessary legal agreement(s) by the Borough Council and the developer/landowner to progress the development of Suffolk Business Park and Eastern Relief Road to enable the Borough Council to realise a return on its previously approved £3 million investment; and
- (c) authority was sought to fund specialist advice of £150,000 in relation to the total project.

On 2 September 2014, the Cabinet resolved that delegated authority should be given to the Head of Economic Development and Growth, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make an application to the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) for a £3 million loan from its Growing Places Fund for electricity infrastructure works. The Cabinet firstly considered it appropriate to amend the officer delegation contained in the original resolution to refer to the Head of Planning and Growth as the post for the aforementioned no longer existed. It then considered a proposal to increase the amount of the loan agreed in September 2014 to £4,528,871 to ensure that the total costs of these works could be covered by the loan. It was anticipated that Taylor Wimpey would contribute a further £1.4 million in relation to the residential development.

Early discussions with officers had indicated that the electricity infrastructure funding for Suffolk Business Park was the type of project that would be likely to be funded under NALEP's Growing Places Fund programme. It is anticipated the application would be determined at the LEP's next Board meeting on 20 March 2015.

It was proposed that the loan (including interest charges) would be met from commercial lets as they came forward for Suffolk Business Park or by the commercial developer who would be appointed to bring the land forward.

The electricity works were proposed to be phased and therefore the provider would also require payments to be provided in stages. The first payment of £100,000 had already been paid by Taylor Wimpey. The second payment amounted to £129,786 and was required to be paid by 27 February 2015 (as a worst case). The third payment of £226,400 was required in Quarter 2 of 2015. These two outstanding payments equated to £356,186 which full Council was being asked to approve later that evening on the Cabinet's recommendations. This sum would be paid from the existing £3m allocation of funding approved by Council on 23 September 2014 if the loan from NALEP had yet to be remitted to the Council.

In addition, there were a number of areas of specialist advice that were required in connection with the project to ensure the Borough Council was working within the law and maximising its best consideration. The table provided in 4.1 of the report set out the requirement and cost of each element. The total request for this advice was a maximum of £150,000, approval of which was also sought from full Council upon the recommendation of Cabinet.

A detailed discussion was held and Members asked questions on a number of issues including:

- (a) the repayment terms and level of interest on the loan from NALEP (if the application was successful);
- (b) the likelihood of Taylor Wimpey allocating £1.4 million for the electricity infrastructure for the residential development;
- (c) the associated risks involved.

The officers responded accordingly, including that the second payment of £129,786, as extracted from the report above, would not need to be paid until 2 April 2015.

Members supported the recommendations, acknowledging that approval would help enable the entire project to come to fruition, and noted that the decisions required by full Council on this matter would be sought that same evening.

RESOLVED:

That the amendment and clarification of resolutions (1) and (2) at its meeting on 2 September 2014 (minute 42 refers) in accordance with paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/017, be approved.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL: That

- (1) subject to the approval of full Council and the satisfaction of the Section 151 and Monitoring Officers, a commitment be made to the full £4,528,871 million programme of works for the provision of electricity to serve Suffolk Business Park, including an immediate financial allocation of £356,186 currently due on**

27 February 2015, as detailed in Section 3 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/017;

- (2) subject to the approval of full Council and the satisfaction of the Section 151 and Monitoring Officers, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Growth in consultation with the Leader of the Council to enter into an agreement or agreements to be entered into by St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) and the developer/landowner to enable the development of Suffolk Business Park and Eastern Relief Road to enable SEBC to realise a return on its investment in line with the principles approved in the Medium Term Financial Strategy; and**
- (3) Council be asked to approve the financial allocation of £150,000 towards the costs of specialist advice for this project from reserves.**

The meeting concluded at 5.15 pm

Signed by:

Chairman

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 12 March 2015	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/020	
Report to and date:	Cabinet	24 March 2015
Chairman of the Committee:	Ian Houlder Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.houlder@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Christine Brain Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01638 719729 Email: christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	On 12 March 2015, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the following items jointly with Forest Heath's Overview and Scrutiny Committee: (1) Draft West Suffolk Annual Report 2014-2015; (2) Monitoring the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership; and (3) Overview and Update of Planning Enforcement Service.	
Recommendation:	The Cabinet is requested to <u>NOTE</u> the content of Report CAB/SE/15/020, being the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Report for information only.	
Consultation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Reports listed under background papers below 	

Alternative option(s):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Reports listed under background papers below 	
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Reports listed under background papers below 	
Are there any staffing implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Reports listed under background papers below 	
Are there any ICT implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Reports listed under background papers below 	
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Reports listed under background papers below 	
Are there any equality implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Reports listed under background papers below 	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
See Reports listed under background papers below			
Ward(s) affected:		All Wards	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		Report OAS/SE/15/001 – Draft West Suffolk Annual Report 2014-2015; Report OAS/SE/15/002 – Monitoring the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership; and Report OAS/SE/15/003 – Overview and Update of Planning Enforcement Service All considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 12 March 2015	
Documents attached:		None	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation

1.1 Draft West Suffolk Annual Report 2014-2015 (Report No: OAS/SE/15/001)

- 1.1.1 The Constitution requires that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee receives reports from the Leader of the Council or representatives of Cabinet, either prior to the commencement of each financial year or at its first meeting after each Annual Council meeting on the state of the Borough, the Cabinet's priorities and its performance in the previous year.
- 1.1.2 The St Edmundsbury Leader, together with the Forest Heath Leader attended this meeting of the Informal Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee and presented the Annual Report, which outlined the Draft West Suffolk Annual Report (2014-2015). The Annual Report for the second time had been written as a joint West Suffolk document and was before the Overview and Scrutiny Committees for their comments.
- 1.1.3 Both Leaders highlighted relevant issues to the attention of the Committees. In particular, economic growth which is a key area across West Suffolk, the councils continued support to the Suffolk Business Park; the West Suffolk Operational Hub; locality budgets and Vision 2031.
- 1.1.4 Members examined the document in detail and asked a number of questions of both Leaders and officers, to which comprehensive responses were provided. Issues discussed included improving educational attainment; the closure of RAF Mildenhall and the expansion of RAF Lakenheath; community centre transfers; locality budgets; parks and green spaces; infrastructure and delivery; affordable homes and councillor learning and development.

1.2 Monitoring the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (Report No: OAS/SE/15/002)

- 1.2.1 It is the duty of the Committee, as the Council's Crime and Disorder Committee designated under the Police and Justice Act 2006, to scrutinise the work of the Partnership.
- 1.2.2 The Committee received and noted the update on the progress of the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) from 1 April 2014 to February 2015.
- 1.2.3 It was confirmed in 2014-2015, by the Police and Crime Commissioner that the Community Safety Partnerships would no longer be the commissioning bodies for the community safety funding and this role would be awarded to the Suffolk Community Foundation. In light of no funding being awarded to the WSCSP, the partnership ceased operating as a commissioning body and undertook a review of its role. However, the WSCSP remained a statutory body and was required to complete an annual strategic assessment, produce a partnership plan and an action plan. In addition, it had a responsibility to conduct Domestic Homicide Reviews as required.
- 1.2.4 A review workshop took place in April 2014, to enable partners to consider a new way of working. Attached as Appendix A to the report, was the WSCSP

Plan, which reflected its new focus and identified a number of key actions. Attached at Appendix B to the report was the Project Plan for community identified priorities. Over the next two years the WSCSP would continue to review its role in light of changing needs and demands and amend its role as appropriate.

- 1.2.5 Members scrutinised the report and asked questions to which responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on the partnership's new way of working and the priorities identified in the strategic review.

- 1.3 **Overview and update of Planning Enforcement Service (Report No: OAS/SE/15/003)**

- 1.3.1 The Committee received and noted an update on the newly formed Shared Planning Enforcement Team, including caseloads and forward work programme.
- 1.3.2 Members were advised that the Enforcement Team will be consulting on producing a Local Enforcement Plan in 2015. The Plan will be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and gives Councils the opportunity to state what work they will do, how they will do it and what will be given priority. One area of consideration was the attention to issues within Conservation Areas where additional resources or monitoring might be appropriate. A declaration of intent within a published plan would go some way to providing clarity to all parties concerned.
- 1.3.3 Work is also being undertaken on making the Enforcement Registers available online and also on producing a periodic update to Ward Members and parishes so that they know what enforcement cases are being looked at in their area.
- 1.3.4 Members scrutinised the report and asked questions to which officers duly responded. Members expressed their delight that a West Suffolk Enforcement Team had been put in place and that the team would especially be looking at enforcement issues within conservation areas.

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Public Service Village Phase II: Update and Next Phase	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/023	
Report to and dates:	Cabinet	24 March 2015
	Special Council	25 March 2015
Portfolio holder:	John Griffiths Leader of the Council Tel: 07958 700434 Email: john.griffiths@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Steven Wood Head of Planning and Regulatory Services Tel: 01284 757306 Email: steven.wood@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	<p>The Public Service Village concept was approved and adopted by the Council in 2006. In agreeing to progressing Phase II, the Council at it's meeting on 16 December 2014, agreed a budget of £100,000 to appoint consultants to review the adopted Masterplan, appoint Project Management resources, and Legal and Property advisors to help formulate the project and ensure that the Council obtains Best Consideration.</p> <p>Good progress is being made with signing up with potential partners to occupying the Olding Road site. The activities approved at the December meeting are also at an advanced stage to provide confidence to take the project to the next stage sooner than expected. To deliver the next stage more permanent arrangements need to be put in place requiring the Council to commit a further £200,000 towards underwriting the continued appointment of legal, property, architectural, project management and other expertise to help progress this initiative to immediately accommodate a partner organisation on site and develop plans to advance proposals with other parties for other parts of the site. These initial costs will be recovered from partner organisations once formal commitments have been made.</p>	

	<p>To this end, the Head of Planning and Growth, in conjunction with the Leader of the Council, need to seek delegated authority to open negotiations with the owner of the NHS distribution unit and potential partners to agree Heads of Terms to be contained within the different partnership and development agreements that are about to be negotiated.</p>
<p>Recommendations:</p>	<p>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that, subject to the approval of full Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the progress of the Public Service Village Phase II (PSVII) Bury St Edmunds project, be noted; (2) £200,000 be allocated from earmarked reserves (Delivering our Strategic Priorities and Medium Term Financial Strategy Reserve) to underwrite the appointment of project management, legal, property and other specialists including architectural expertise, as detailed in Section 1.3 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/023; (3) the Head of Planning and Growth, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be given delegated authority to negotiate Heads of Terms for a joint venture with the owners of the NHS distribution unit, and partnership agreements with potential occupiers of PSVII, as detailed in Section 1.1.7 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/023; and (4) the Cabinet is requested to <u>NOTE</u> the exemption to the Contract Procedure Rules, as detailed in Sections 1.2.3 to 1.2.5 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/023.
<p>Key Decision:</p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>(as full Council approval required)</p>
<p>Consultation:</p>	<p>Extensive consultation will be undertaken as part of the review of the Masterplan for this site. In addition, stakeholders will be incorporated into the project management governance structure.</p>

Alternative option(s):		The Masterplan process in June 2006 will have sequentially looked at a variety of uses and alternative sites but found this site as the best place for the development of the Public Service Village.	
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> The initial financial commitment was £100,000 to commission Masterplanning, project management legal and property experts to properly assess the potential commitment going forward. The additional £200,000 requested in this report acknowledges the speed that this project is progressing but acknowledges that these initial expenses will be recovered as the project is progressed once partners on board.	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> • See above.	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Town and Country Planning Act for all the planning considerations. Localism Act 2011 to ensure the Council gets "best consideration"	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Diversity and Equality issues will be tested at each stage of the project and an Equality Impact Assessment will be part of the initial stages of revising the Masterplan.	
<i>Is there any other impact? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> This project is linked to the plan for the relocation of the depot and therefore relies on the success of that project. The commitment of stakeholders to the project will be critical and the close association of this project with Bury St Edmunds Leisure Centre and the West Suffolk College.	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)

Not continuing with the appointed legal and property expertise or dedicated project Manager	High	Continue with the appropriate professional appointments to protect the council's interests. Appoint a dedicated Project Manager.	Medium
Achieving best consideration.	High	Make appropriate professional appointments to protect the council's interests. Adopt strict project management principles to manage the project. At the appropriate stage appoint a project board.	Medium
Achieving project delivery with a start date of end of 2016	High	Gateway project management, appropriate level of resources at each stage of the project. Good project management and corporate commitment.	Medium
Ward(s) affected:	All Wards		
Background papers:	Cabinet Report No: CAB/SE/14/010		
Documents attached:	None		

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Key issues

- 1.1.1 On 16 December 2014, the Council was reminded about the concept of a Public Service Village on the Olding Road site and how that was contained in a Masterplan approved in June 2006. West Suffolk House (WSH) being the first phase had successfully achieved its objectives in accommodating staff from St Edmundsbury Borough Council (and now both West Suffolk councils) and Suffolk County Council together with other public sector organisations.
- 1.1.2 Council made a further commitment to this project and agreed an initial budget of £100,000 to put in place resources to bring together a team of experts to review the Masterplan for the site and progress matters with the new owner of the DHL (NHS Logistics) building which had been excluded from the previous plans (Referral from Cabinet to Council Report No: COU/SE/14/001 (B) (6) refers).
- 1.1.3 The Council had been able to resurrect its plans for this project because of the improving economic environment and changes in ownership of the DHL (NHS Logistics) building. In addition and importantly the plans for the relocation of the depot also contributed to the Council being able to bring this project forward.
- 1.1.4 The project therefore has two key components:
- (a) the review of the Masterplan to include the DHL Building and any changes in the economic environment since the adoption in 2006 and importantly provide planning certainty; and
 - (b) develop a phased approach to deliver the aspirations contained in the revised Masterplan by entering into partnerships with key stakeholders and the new landowners of the DHL building.
- 1.1.5 The first part of the project has been scoped and the scheme is progressing more quickly than expected with a number of public sector organisations expressing real interest and one wanting to commit as soon as possible. The Council initially approved £100,000 to fund the appointments of a dedicated project manager, legal and property consultants in addition to experts to revise the Masterplan.
- 1.1.6 To maintain the pace and deliver the next stage, more permanent arrangements need to be put in place requiring the Council to commit to underwrite a further £200,000 towards the continued appointment of legal, property, project management and other expertise. This will help progress this initiative immediately to accommodate a partner organisation on site and develop plans to advance proposals with other parties for other parts of the site. This next stage will also include architectural advice. These initial costs will be recovered from partner organisations once formal commitments have been made.

1.1.7 The Public Service Village Phase II proposal has generated a great deal of interest with various public sector partners. It is therefore important that the momentum of this project is maintained and therefore the Head of Planning and Growth would like to be granted delegated authority to continue these discussions to a point where they can be formulated into Heads of Terms and incorporated in a joint venture or partnership and developer agreement. It is proposed that this delegation would be used in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

1.2 **Masterplan**

1.2.1 The review of the current Masterplan is now underway which has included the commissioning a topographic survey and transport study.

1.2.2 If the Council is to achieve the start on site deadline estimated to be the later part of 2016, the present Masterplan is required to be revised. This revision work requires to be started immediately and to this end Pick Everard have been identified to carry out this work. Pick Everard were the consultant team used to deliver the Masterplan in 2006 and were the architects involved in the WSH construction.

1.2.3 The Cabinet is therefore asked to note that section 4.3 of the Contract Procedure Rules states: *'Between £50,001 and the EU Threshold any exemption must be approved by the Officer and Head of Service in consultation with the Head of Resources and Performance. The Officer must produce evidence to support the request for any exemption. The Head of Service shall prepare a report for the next Cabinet to support the action taken. The exemption, being a Contracting Decision, the reason for it (together with support evidence) shall be forwarded to the Head of Resources and Performance'*.

1.2.4 This exemption was exercised on 19 February 2015 for a contract to Pick Everard, valued at £60,000, for the urgent review of the Public Service Village Masterplan, including transport survey work for the Public Service Village Phase II project which is to complete the development of the Council owned site bounded by Western Way and Beeton's Way, Bury St Edmunds.

1.2.5 The exemption was made because:

- (a) there was a time constraint put on the project timetable which meant that action needed to be taken to ensure the Council was able to complete the review of the Masterplan before the end of 2015; and
- (b) the Council needs to take advantage of an improving economy and interest from potential partners for inclusion into the project against very challenging timescales.

1.3 **Resources**

1.3.1 Phase II of the Public Service Village project will be a major investment opportunity, one of the largest developments in the Borough and a catalyst for other neighbouring sites. It is important that in recognising this, appropriate resources are committed at this early stage. The specialist expertise needed at

this next stage is not available within the present establishment, as it wasn't with Phase 1 of the project.

- 1.3.2 Good progress has been made and initial interest from public sector partners is very strong. This has happened sooner than anticipated. To ensure, therefore, that the Council can continue to take advantage of these negotiations and start to put together proposals for the accommodation for potential partners, the appropriate specialists need to be commissioned beyond the next stage of this project.
- 1.3.3 The interest by potential partners and the speed in which potential partners wish their enquiries to be progressed has been really very encouraging. Following the initial commission, which focused on the development partner and the review of the Masterplan, further appointments need to be made, with an extra £200,000 allocated from earmarked reserves (Delivering our Strategic Priorities and Medium Term Financial Strategy Reserve) to appoint the project manager for this second stage. Once partners are committed these costs will be recovered.
- 1.3.4 Once the partnerships as described have been formulated, the project governance and budget will be progressed and brought to Cabinet accordingly.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet




St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Sponsorship and Advertising Policy for West Suffolk	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/025	
Report to and date:	Cabinet	24 March 2015
Portfolio holder:	David Ray Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01359 250912 Email: david.ray@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Richard Hartley Commercial Manager Tel: 01284 757055 Email: richard.hartley@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	The draft policy lays out the definitions, general principles and procedures for entering into agreements for sponsorship and advertising, so as to maintain propriety and transparency within the councils. This is an updated version of the previous St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) policy, adopted in 2007. A new policy is needed because of moving forward with the shared services agenda and also because we are trying to behave more commercially in maximising the use of our assets.	
Recommendation:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the Sponsorship and Advertising Policy for West Suffolk, as contained in Appendix 1 to Report No: CAB/SE/15/025, be approved.	
Key Decision: (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Pending any further guidance from the Secretary of State, a decision which results in expenditure or savings of more than £50,000 will normally be considered as a key decision.</p>	

*The key decision made as a result of this report will be published within **48 hours** and cannot be actioned until **seven working days** have elapsed. This item is included on the Decisions Plan.*

Consultation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an updated version of the previously adopted policy in SEBC produced in 2007. • There has been internal consultation with different council services on this document.
Alternative option(s):	<p>There were several options open to us:</p> <p>Do Nothing – This was not recommended as there would not be a policy covering all of West Suffolk.</p> <p>Open approach – A more open approach without safeguards is not recommended as this would risk non-compliance with the codes of conduct and advertising codes (See Appendix 1, section 2.4)</p>
Implications:	
<p>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for income generation.
<p>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be managed within existing resources.
<p>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be managed within existing resources.
<p>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The councils are permitted to accept appropriate sponsorship and to sell advertising space • Advertising Standards Authority standards should also be followed as noted in the new policy document and links to the appropriate guidance are referenced.
<p>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken. Fairness and equality are fundamental to a sustainable society. This is reflected in the proposed policy.</p>

Risk/opportunity assessment:		The purpose of the new policy is to highlight the income opportunity available from sponsorship and advertising. By not promoting the assets of the Councils there is a potential risk of cuts to services. On the other hand, should advertising or sponsorship be accepted in an uncontrolled manner there is the risk to reputation of the Councils.	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
Loss of income opportunity	Medium	Transfer to commercial team and promote more rigorously	Low
Potential reputational damage	Medium	Centralise and consult prior to approval	Low
Ward(s) affected:		All Wards	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		<p>The current adopted sponsorship Policy document can be found here.</p>  <p>Adopted Sponsorship Policy 051207.doc</p> <p>The recently adopted fees and charges policy which mentions sponsorship can be found here</p> <p>http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/Council/Policies Strategies and Plans/upload/WSFeesAndChargesPolicy.pdf</p>	
Documents attached:		Appendix 1: Sponsorship and Advertising Policy for West Suffolk	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Current offer

- 1.1.1 The current sponsorship policy is considered outdated and is no longer fit for purpose as it takes a narrow approach. The councils' 'behaving more commercially' agenda has opened up more opportunities for sponsorship through other elements of the councils' business, which requires a broader approach. There is also no policy covering Forest Heath District Council so there is an opportunity for a revised policy to cover the whole of West Suffolk.

2. New Sponsorship and Advertising Policy

- 2.1 The new draft policy makes clear to potential advertisers and sponsors how their request will be dealt with. It will help avoid doubt and potential disagreements when dealing with future requests or approaches by either the sponsors or advertisers or by members of council staff.
- 2.2 The draft policy, attached at Appendix 1, lays out the proposed principles, definitions and procedures for adoption without which the council would be leaving itself exposed to fraud, error or loss of reputation in accepting any sponsorship and advertising. The draft policy also aims to increase transparency and accountability.
- 2.3 Attracting appropriate external funding will remain the responsibility of all frontline teams. However, the draft policy also includes a proposal to transfer central oversight and support for advertising and sponsorship activities from the councils' communications department to the commercial team, in order to seize the opportunity for income generation. Together, Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Councils have received around thirty thousand pounds in sponsorship income in 2014/2015 which includes notable sponsorship of benches in the parks and contributions towards the Bury St Edmunds Festival. By transferring this to the commercial team it is hoped that by highlighting the opportunities, income will increase in the year 2015/2016.
- 2.4 By taking the proposed actions, the aim is to drive a middle course between being commercial and light touch, and making sure the council staff behave impartially and as good stewards of public resources.

Sponsorship and Advertising Policy for West Suffolk
Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council
(the councils)
March 2015

1 DEFINITION

'Sponsorship' - is a contract between parties in which one party meets all or part of the costs of the project or activity, usually in exchange for commercial benefit.

'Advertising' – is a contract between parties promoting a product (or service) to potential and current customers. Advertising is typically displayed on signs, brochures, websites, direct mailings or e-mail messages etc.

2 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- 2.1 In entering into agreements for sponsorship or advertising, there must be transparency of process in order to protect the councils' reputation and to manage expectations.
- 2.2 The councils' constitutions and policy frameworks, and in particular, the codes of conduct for councillors and employees must be observed. Sponsorship and advertising agreements must also comply with the councils' equality and diversity policies.
- 2.3 The councils actively seek local and national opportunities of mutual benefit and welcome sponsorship and advertising where:
 - a) the opportunity aligns with the councils' values;
 - b) it does not, and could not reasonably be perceived as, influencing the way the councils exercise a statutory function;
 - c) it does not, and could not reasonably be perceived as, attempting to influence the outcome of a decision to be made by the councils;
 - d) it does not, and could not reasonably be perceived as, influencing the councils' allocation of resources; and
 - e) it could not reasonably be perceived as being used by the sponsor to gain favourable terms.
- 2.4 Therefore the councils will not consider sponsorship or advertising which:
 - a)
 - i) is against the Advertising Standards Authority's advertising code; www.asa.org.uk
 - ii) does not uphold the rules laid out in the UK Code of Non-broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing (CAP Code) www.cap.org.uk/Advertising-Codes/Non-broadcast-HTML.aspx

iii) does not follow the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority publicity
www.gov.uk/government/publications/recommended-code-of-practice-for-local-authority-publicity

- b) creates legal or financial conflict with the interests of the councils;
- c) has party-political associations;
- d) conflicts with the councils' branding;
- e) involves unlawful prejudice and/or discrimination;
- f) promotes smoking;
- g) promotes irresponsible consumption of alcohol;
- h) involves sexual content;
- i) involves violent content; or
- j) could otherwise bring the councils into disrepute or conflict with contractual obligations.

This is not an exhaustive list and any approach can be declined at the councils' sole discretion by an officer of the councils.

- 2.5 While it is expected that most sponsorship will be offered on the basis that it is in return for publicity or an advertising platform, the councils will of course welcome any sponsorship that is offered with no expectation of any benefit to the donor.

3 CO-ORDINATION AND APPROVAL PROCEDURE

- 3.1 Approaches to or by potential sponsors/advertisers must be co-ordinated through the councils' Commercial Team. The value of the sponsorship or advertising and the criteria for selection of a sponsor must be agreed with the Commercial Team.

3.2 Depending on the value of the sponsorship or advertising, different approval and thresholds apply, as shown in the table below.

Value		Level of approval				
	Publicise	Commercial Manager*	Head of Service	Leadership Team	Portfolio Holder	Cabinet
£1 - £1,000	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
£1,001 - £10,000	Open invitation through e.g Suffolk sourcing	Yes	No	No	No	No
£10,001 - £50,000	Open invitation through e.g Suffolk sourcing	Yes	Yes	Yes possible referral to Cabinet	Yes	Possibly
£50,001 and above	Open invitation through e.g Suffolk sourcing	Yes	Yes	Yes possible referral to Cabinet	Yes	Possibly

*In the absence of the Commercial Manager the Commercial Manager's line manager will be available for approvals.

3.3 The councils will agree with the sponsor/advertiser the nature and content of the publicity and will retain the right to approve all advertising material and to remove any material which has not received such approval.

3.4 Where a request for sponsorship or advertising is connected to a matter of current policy with particular sensitivity (for example, a current council decision) the officer handling the request is required to consult the Leadership Team who may recommend a referral to the relevant Cabinet.

3.5 For significant sponsorship or advertising a named officer must be nominated as the sponsor/advertiser's contact.

3.6 All potential sponsors and advertisers must sign a declaration (as part of the financial form – see paragraph 4.2 below) to say that they are not in arrears on any payments to the councils or the subject of investigation or enforcement by the councils or any other statutory body. The councils reserve the right to refuse sponsorship if the potential sponsor does not fulfil these requirements.

4 FINANCIAL PROCEDURE

- 4.1 Payment terms must be agreed by the commercial team on a case by case basis and in line with other payment policies.
- 4.2 An account (Sponsorship-Customer info request) form is available on request. The description of any agreement must be attached to this form. This must be completed and signed by both parties before any agreement starts.
- 4.3 When the councils incur any direct costs payment must be received in advance.

5 TRANSPARENCY

A list of sponsors and details of what they have sponsored will be published on the councils' website except where the donor wishes to remain anonymous (and the councils agree to the anonymity).

6 MARKETING AND MEDIA RELATIONS

- 6.1 Sponsors should refer all media enquiries about sponsorship and advertising to the councils' Corporate Communications Team.
- 6.2 Any use of West Suffolk's corporate branding must be approved by the Corporate Communications Team.

7.0 DISCLAIMER

- 7.1 Acceptance of advertising or sponsorship does not imply endorsement by the councils of products and services. In order to make this clear all publications, or other media, with advertising or sponsorship should carry the following disclaimer:

'Whilst every effort has been made to ensure advertising within this publication complies with all relevant legislation, West Suffolk councils cannot accept any liability for errors or omissions contained in any material provided by an advertiser. The councils do not accept any liability for any information or claims made by the advertisement or by the advertisers. Any inclusion of the councils' name on a publication should not be taken as an endorsement by the councils.

- 7.2 Where it is not possible to print a disclaimer, for example in the case of an advertising hoarding, the material should identify the West Suffolk councils as being the owner and that this policy is available on the councils' website.

8. COUNCILLORS AS SPONSORS OF COUNCIL EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

- 8.1 There is no bar on county, district and parish councillors offering sponsorship to the councils either by sponsoring council events or activities as individuals or through a business. However, apart from the conditions that apply to all potential sponsors, care must be taken that the sponsorship would not contravene the councillors' Code of Conduct or the restrictions on council publicity, particularly during the sensitive pre-election period. The advice of the Monitoring Officer will therefore be sought when a councillor puts forward a sponsorship proposal.

9 CONTACTS

- 9.1 Getting started, general advice:
Commercial Manager
01284 757055
commercial@westsuffolk.gov.uk
- 9.2 Media relations and corporate identity:
Corporate Communications Team
01284 757034
communications@westsuffolk.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Recommendation of the Bury St Edmunds Area Working Party: 10 March 2015	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/027	
Report to and date:	Cabinet	24 March 2015
Portfolio holder:	Terry Clements Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation Tel: 01284 827161 Email: terry.clements@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Chairman of the Working Party:	Robert Everitt Bury St Edmunds Area Working Party Tel: 01284 769000 Email: robert.everitt@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Christine Leveson Principal Conservation Officer Tel: 01284 757356 Email: chris.leveson@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	On 10 March 2015, the Bury St Edmunds Area Working Party considered the 'Amendments to the Article 4 Directions in the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre and Victoria Street Conservation Areas' as a substantive item of business. Recommendations emanating from the discussions are provided for Cabinet's consideration below.	
Recommendations:	<p>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that consultation be carried out on:</p> <p>(1) the proposed new Article 4 Directions for the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre and Victoria Street Conservation Areas, as set out in BAW/SE/15/001; and</p> <p>(2) the removal of Permitted Development Rights in respect of micro-generation equipment within both these areas in accordance with the amended timetable set out in paragraph 1.1.5 of Report No: CAB/SE/15/027 .</p>	

Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>		<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Consultation:		• See Report No: BAW/SE/15/001	
Alternative option(s):		• None	
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>		No	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>		No	
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		No	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes see paragraph 1.1.3 below	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		No	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
None			
Ward(s) affected:		Bury St Edmunds Wards within the conservation areas	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		None	
Documents attached:		None	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

1.1 Amendments to the Article 4 Directions in the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre and Victoria Street Conservation Areas (Report No: BAW/SE/15/001)

- 1.1.1 Following a recommendation from the Overview and Scrutiny Task & Finish Group, the Bury St Edmunds Area Working Party endorsed amendments to the Article 4 Directions in the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre and Victoria Street Conservation Areas (Report D369 of 13 May 2013 refers). Whilst it was originally intended to give effect to the proposed changes during 2013/early 2014, this was delayed due to the capacity of the Conservation Team and the need to re-visit the amendments to the Haverhill Article 4 Direction.
- 1.1.2 Before the consultation can begin, the paperwork must be prepared. This includes the letter to residents, the formal Notices and Directions, site notices and press notices and releases. The current Article 4 Direction advisory leaflet must also be amended and details of the drop-in sessions confirmed so these can be included in the letter to residents. Officers advised that investigations were being carried out into facilitating responses to the consultation to be made by electronic means.
- 1.1.3 The proposed new Article 4 Directions will include the removal of permitted development rights for solar panels, photo voltaic cells etc. This can only be done after giving notice and the new Directions will not become effective until approved by Cabinet. It is therefore intended to keep the process as short as possible to minimise the likelihood of works taking place prior to the Directions taking effect, whilst still giving residents sufficient time to consider the proposals and submit comments.
- 1.1.4 The report to the Area Working Party indicated a proposed timetable which involved consultation with it in early June 2015, and referral onto Cabinet in late June. It was clarified at the meeting that, after the forthcoming Borough Council elections, the new Cabinet would review its working parties and panels at its first or second meeting, after which a meeting timetable would be set. Therefore, it may not actually be possible to achieve the initially proposed timetable for the consultation in practical terms, without delaying the Cabinet's decision (and implementation of any changes). If that was the case, the Working Party noted that alternative arrangements would be made to ensure that Bury St Edmunds Ward Members were still advised of the responses to the public consultation and asked for their own views in the light of those responses. The views of the councillors would then still be reported to Cabinet in June to inform the Cabinet's decision.

1.1.5 It is therefore proposed that the work plan for amending the Article 4 Directions is as follows:

Prepare paperwork:	March 2015
Consultation:	Six weeks from start of April to mid-May (with drop-in sessions around weeks two and four)
Assess responses and write report:	mid/end May 2015
Consult Bury St Edmunds ward members on draft report:	Early June 2015
Cabinet for decision:	Late June 2015
Confirm amendments (if approved):	July 2015

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Recommendations from the Grant Working Party: 13 March 2015	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/028	
Report to and date:	Cabinet	24 March 2015
Portfolio holder:	Sara Mildmay-White Portfolio Holder for Health and Communities Tel: 01359 270580 Email: sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Chairman of the Working Party:	Angela Rushen Grant Working Party Tel: 01284 386647 Email: angela.rushen@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Davina Howes Head of Families and Communities Tel: 01284 757070 Email: davina.howes@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	On 13 March 2015, the Grant Working Party considered the 'New approach to grant funding arrangements and review of the Locality Budget Scheme' as a substantive item of business. Recommendations emanating from the discussions are provided for Cabinet's consideration below.	
Recommendations:	<p>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that:</p> <p>(1) the revised approach to grant funding from 2015/2016 including the establishment of a Community Chest, as set out in Section 1.3 of Report No: GWP/SE/15/002, be approved;</p> <p>(2) (a) the Head of Families and Communities, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder with the responsibility for Grants, be given delegated powers to make awards from the Community Chest funding to the value of £10,000, as set out in paragraph 1.4.4 of Report No: GWP/SE/15/002;</p>	

	<p>(b) subject to (2)(a) above, the Grant Working Party firstly be consulted by email on grants proposed to be awarded under this delegation using a similar procedure to that applied under the existing Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme;</p> <p>(3) the existing St Edmundsbury Grant Policy be revoked and from April 2015 be replaced with the new criteria, as outlined in Appendix A to Report No: GWP/SE/15/002;</p> <p>(4) the success of the Locality Budget Scheme to date be noted and subject to the amendment below, revisions to the scheme to be implemented for 2015/2016, be approved:</p> <p><i>the sentence, 'For the purposes of this scheme, a rural parish council is considered to be a parish with a population of 1,000 or fewer according to the latest mid year estimate figures', be deleted from paragraph 1.7 of Appendix B to Report No: GWP/SE/15/002; and</i></p> <p>(5) any Locality Budget underspend for 2014/2015 with the exception of the £500 per Councillor carry-forward, be approved and retained within the Locality Budget fund for allocation in future years, as outlined in Section 3.2 of Report No: GWP/SE/15/002.</p>
<p>Key Decision:</p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Pending any further guidance from the Secretary of State, a decision which results in expenditure or savings of more than £50,000 will normally be considered as a key decision.</p>
<p>Consultation:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002
<p>Alternative option(s):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002
<p>Implications:</p>	
<p><i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002</p>
<p><i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002</p>

<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Report No: GWP/SE/15/002	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
See Report: GWP/SE/15/002			
Ward(s) affected:		All Wards	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		Grant Working Party: 13 March 2015 Report No: GWP/SE/15/002	
Documents attached:		None	

1. New Approach to Grant Funding Arrangements and Review of the Locality Budget Scheme (Report No: GWP/SE/15/002)

- 1.1 Report No: GWP/SE/15/002 provided proposals for new grant funding arrangements and for the locality budget scheme to be continued with revisions following the review of its pilot in 2014/2015.
- 1.2 A new approach was proposed to support families and communities, as provided in textual and diagrammatic form in the report, which aimed to simplify the present arrangements and funding types, with differing degrees of devolution of control to local communities.
- 1.3 The following proposed three funding streams were:
- (a) Locality Budgets;
 - (b) Community Chest; and
 - (c) Portfolio Holder Budgets.
- 1.4 The report provides further details on the remit of each of the above and examples of the types of grant that will typically derive from each stream.
- 1.5 Section 2 provides details of the Locality Budget Scheme review and proposed revisions to the scheme following its successful pilot in 2014/2015.
- 1.6 The following appendices are attached to the report.
- Appendix A: Criteria for community grant funding;
 - Appendix B: revised councillor guidance for the Locality Budget Scheme; and
 - Appendix C: a revised application form for use with the Locality Budget Scheme.
- 1.7 The officers informed that a revision to Recommendation (2) provided in Report No: GWP/SE/15/002 was required, as the proposed delegation should be to the Head of Service, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, and not to the Portfolio Holder him/herself.

New Approach to Grant Funding

- 1.7.1 The Grant Working Party firstly considered the proposed changes to the grants process, which included the establishment of a Community Chest and introducing delegations within that funding stream to enable the Head of Families and Communities, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder to award grants up to the value of £10,000.
- 1.7.2 £10,000 was considered to be significant amount of money to be allocated under the above delegation and the Working Party expressed an interest in remaining involved in discussions should the Head of Service and Portfolio Holder need to consider granting funding using these delegated powers. It was therefore suggested that the Working Party be consulted by email on grants proposed to be awarded under this delegation in a similar way that is applied when determining applications made under the existing Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme (as outlined in Appendix A). This proposal was

accepted by the Working Party and together with the revisions to the delegations outlined in 1.7 above, this proposal has been included as an additional recommendation as (2)(b) above.

- 1.7.3 During the discussion of this item, Members noted that the existing Rural Initiatives Grant Scheme will continue as a ring-fenced grant within the Community Chest until all of the remaining £67,444 has been allocated. A formal decision would need to be taken by Cabinet and Council as part of the budget setting process as to whether or not to replenish this fund and if so, by how much.

Locality Budget Scheme

- 1.7.4 Discussion was then held on the Members' Locality Budget Scheme, which had been piloted in 2014/2015. The Working Party acknowledged the success of the pilot and supported its continuation into 2015/2016.
- 1.7.5 Discussion was held on the following paragraph, as set out in the proposed Guidance to Councillors on the Locality Budget Scheme, attached as Appendix B:

1.7 As community activity in many rural areas is often led or supported by the parish council funding may in exceptional cases be granted to support activities which are for the benefit of the community, but which are directly delivered by the rural parish councils. For the purposes of this scheme, a rural parish council is considered to be a parish with a population of 1,000 or fewer according to the latest mid-year estimate figures. Funding must not be used to supplement services or functions provided by the parish council which are or could normally be provided through its own resources. Members should be satisfied that the request for funding for the rural parish meets all the requirements (as summarised in 1.5 of this guidance).

- 1.7.6 Members recognised that this paragraph had been introduced to provide flexibility and to enable projects to be supported in some of the smaller rural parishes more easily. Any allocated funding was not meant for parish councils to support services normally provided by them and this was about enabling a means of banking the funding on behalf of those that did not have formally constituted bank accounts. However, concern was expressed that to define the eligibility of a parish by its population within this part of the scheme was an inappropriate method of determining whether funding should be granted to parish councils in such exceptional cases described above. It was considered that the Ward Member should be able to use their own discretion as to whether applications fell within these criteria. The Working Party therefore wishes to recommend that the following sentence from paragraph 1.7 of Appendix B, as reproduced above, be deleted from the Locality Budget Scheme:

For the purposes of this scheme, a rural parish council is considered to be a parish with a population of 1,000 or fewer according to the latest mid-year estimate figures.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Revenues Collection Performance and Write-Offs	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/029 [to be completed by Democratic Services]	
Report to and date:	Cabinet	24 March 2015
Portfolio holder:	Dave Ray Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01359 250912 Email: david.ray@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance Tel: 01638 719245 Email: rachael.mann@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To consider the current revenue collection performance and to consider writing off outstanding debts, as detailed in the exempt appendices.	
Recommendation:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the write-off of the amounts detailed in the exempt appendices to Report No: CAB/SE/15/029 be approved, as follows: Exempt Appendix 1: Council Tax totalling £12,526.75 Exempt Appendix 2: Business Rates totalling £5,190.50	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Consultation:	Leadership Team and the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance have been consulted with on the proposed write-offs.	
Alternative option(s):	See paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2	
Implications:		
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> • See paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3	
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	

<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> The recovery procedures followed have been previously agreed; writing off uncollectable debt allows staff to focus recovery action on debt which is recoverable.	
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application of predetermined recovery procedures ensures that everybody is treated consistently. • Failure to collect any debt impacts on either the levels of service provision or the levels of charges. • All available remedies are used to recover the debt before write off is considered. • The provision of services by the Council applies to everyone in the area. 	
Risk/opportunity assessment:		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
Debts are written off which could have been collected.	Medium	Extensive recovery procedures are in place to ensure that all possible mechanisms are exhausted before a debt is written off.	Low
Ward(s) affected:		All wards are affected.	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		None	
Documents attached:		Exempt Appendix 1: Council Tax Exempt Appendix 2: Business Rates	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)

- 1.1 The Revenues Section collects outstanding debts in accordance with either statutory guidelines or Council agreed procedures.
- 1.2 When all these procedures have been exhausted the outstanding debt is written off using the delegated authority of the Head of Resources and Performance for debts up to £2,499.99 or by Cabinet for debts over £2,500.00.
- 1.3 It is best practice to monitor the recovery procedures for outstanding debts regularly and, when appropriate, write off irrecoverable debts.
- 1.4 Provision for irrecoverable debts is included both in the Collection Fund and the General Fund and writing off debts that are known to be irrecoverable ensures that staff are focussed on achieving good collection levels in respect of the recoverable debt.

2. Alternative options

- 2.1 The Council has appointed a firm of bailiffs to assist in the collection business rates and Council Tax and also has on line tracing facilities. It is not considered appropriate to pass the debts on to another agency.
- 2.2 It should be noted that in the event that a written-off debt become recoverable, the amount is written back on, and enforcement procedures are re-established. This might happen, for example, if someone has gone away with no trace, and then they are unexpectedly 'found' again, through whatever route.

3. Financial implications and collection performance

- 3.1 Provision is made in the accounts for non recovery but the total amounts to be written off are as follows: Council Tax, £12,526.75 and Business Rates, £5,190.50 with full details shown in Exempt Appendices 1 and 2.
- 3.2 As at 28 February 2015, the total National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR) billed by Anglia Revenues Partnership on behalf of St Edmundsbury Borough Council (as the billing Authority) is nearly £47.3 million per annum. The collection rate as at 28 February 2015 was 95.95% against a profile of 95.59%.
- 3.3 As at 28 February 2015, the total Council Tax billed by Anglia Revenues Partnership on behalf of St Edmundsbury Borough Council (includes the County, Police and Parish precept elements) is just under £53.8 million per annum. The collection rate as at 28 February 2015 was 97.20% against a profiled target of 97.71%.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank