

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Title:	Agenda														
Date:	Wednesday 15 March 2017														
Time:	4.00 pm														
Venue:	Conference Chamber West West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds														
Full Members:	<p>Chairman Diane Hind</p> <p>Vice Chairman Jeremy Farthing</p> <p><u>Conservative Members (12)</u></p> <table> <tr> <td>Simon Brown</td><td>Angela Rushen</td></tr> <tr> <td>Patrick Chung</td><td>Andrew Speed</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jeremy Farthing</td><td>Clive Springett</td></tr> <tr> <td>Paula Fox</td><td>Sarah Stamp</td></tr> <tr> <td>Susan Glossop</td><td>Jim Thorndyke</td></tr> <tr> <td>Richard Rout</td><td>Frank Warby</td></tr> </table> <p><u>Charter Member (1)</u> Diane Hind</p> <p><u>Independent Member (1)</u> Paul Hopfensperger</p> <p><u>UKIP Member (2)</u></p> <table> <tr> <td>Tony Brown</td><td>John Burns</td></tr> </table>	Simon Brown	Angela Rushen	Patrick Chung	Andrew Speed	Jeremy Farthing	Clive Springett	Paula Fox	Sarah Stamp	Susan Glossop	Jim Thorndyke	Richard Rout	Frank Warby	Tony Brown	John Burns
Simon Brown	Angela Rushen														
Patrick Chung	Andrew Speed														
Jeremy Farthing	Clive Springett														
Paula Fox	Sarah Stamp														
Susan Glossop	Jim Thorndyke														
Richard Rout	Frank Warby														
Tony Brown	John Burns														
Substitutes:	<p><u>Conservative Members (6)</u></p> <table> <tr> <td>Wayne Hailstone</td><td>David Roach</td></tr> <tr> <td>Margaret Marks</td><td>Peter Thompson</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jane Midwood</td><td>Patricia Warby</td></tr> </table> <p><u>Charter Member (1)</u> Julia Wakelam</p> <p><u>UKIP Member (1)</u> Anthony Williams</p>	Wayne Hailstone	David Roach	Margaret Marks	Peter Thompson	Jane Midwood	Patricia Warby								
Wayne Hailstone	David Roach														
Margaret Marks	Peter Thompson														
Jane Midwood	Patricia Warby														
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:	Six Members														
Committee administrator:	<p>Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</p>														

Public Information



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Venue:	West Suffolk House Western Way Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 3YU	Tel: 01284 763233 Email: democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk Web: www.westsuffolk.gov.uk
Access to agenda and reports before the meeting:	Copies of the agenda and reports are open for public inspection at the above address at least five clear days before the meeting. They are also available to view on our website.	
Attendance at meetings:	The Borough Council actively welcomes members of the public and the press to attend its meetings and holds as many of its meetings as possible in public.	
Public speaking:	Members of the public who live or work in the Borough are invited to put one question or statement of not more than three minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within three minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply. A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start. There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.	
Disabled access:	West Suffolk House has facilities for people with mobility impairments including a lift and wheelchair accessible WCs. However, in the event of an emergency use of the lifts is restricted for health and safety reasons. Visitor parking is at the car park at the front of the building and there are a number of accessible spaces.	
Induction loop:	An Induction loop is available for meetings held in the Conference Chamber.	
Recording of meetings:	The Council may record this meeting and permits members of the public and media to record or broadcast it as well (when the media and public are not lawfully excluded). Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Administrator who will instruct that they are not included in the filming.	

Agenda

Procedural Matters

Part 1 - Public

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Substitutes

Any Member who is substituting for another Member should so indicate, together with the name of the relevant absent Member.

3. Minutes

1 - 10

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2017 (copy attached).

4. Public Participation

Members of the public who live or work in the Borough are invited to put one question or statement of not more than 3 minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within 3 minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply. A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time of the meeting is scheduled to start. There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes of public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.

5. Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance

11 - 14

Report No: **OAS/SE/17/008**

The Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance has been invited to the meeting to provide an annual account on his portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.

6. Update on Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan and North West Relief Road, Haverhill

15 - 26

Report No: **OAS/SE/17/009**

7. Decisions Plan: March 2017 to May 2017

27 - 42

Report No: **OAS/SE/17/010**

8. Work Programme Update

43 - 50

Report No: **OAS/SE/17/011**

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Minutes of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Wednesday 11 January 2017** at **4.00 pm** at the **Conference Chamber, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds IP33 3YU**

Present: **Councillors**

Chairman Diane Hind

Simon Brown
Tony Brown
John Burns
Paula Fox
Susan Glossop
Paul Hopfensperger
Richard Rout

Angela Rushen
Andrew Speed
Clive Springett
Sarah Stamp
Jim Thorndyke
Frank Warby

Substitutes attending:

Margaret Marks

By Invitation:

Robert Everitt, Cabinet Member for Families and Communities
David Nettleton
Joanna Rayner, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture
Peter Stevens, Cabinet Member for Operations

Observing:

Carol Bull
Ian Houlder, Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance
Andrew Smith

125. **Substitutes**

The following substitution was declared:

Councillor Margaret Marks for Councillor Jeremy Farthing.

126. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Patrick Chung and Jeremy Farthing.

127. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2016, were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

128. Public Participation

There were no questions/statements from members of the public.

129. St Andrews Car Park

[Councillor Andrew Speed arrived at 4.05pm during the consideration of this item]

Councillor David Nettleton, had been invited to the meeting to present to the Committee his motion, which was submitted to Council on 20 December 2016, and had subsequently been referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration. The motion stated:

The St Andrews short-stay car park is half-empty Monday to Friday, whereas the long-stay section is often close to capacity. The reason is that the current pricing policy encourages shoppers to occupy spaces in the long-stay section intended for town centre workers. By making minor adjustments to the tariffs in both sections of this car park, a more even spread of parking can be achieved for the benefit of our customers and without compromising income streams designed to meet revenue budget targets previously agreed by the Council. The anticipated date of implementation is Monday 3 April 2017.

I therefore propose that the tariffs are revised to the following: (changes highlighted in bold):-

*Short-stay section: 30 minutes 60p: 1 hour £1.10 (no change to either): **3 hours £2.** At present, there is a 2 hour option at £2 and a 3 hour option at £2.70. Our customers clearly don't like paying more than £2 for a short-stay of up to 3 hours in this car park, as the number of events per tariff band indicates.*

*Long-stay section: **Daily £4** (up from £3). The current difference between 3 hours in the short-stay section and the daily tariff is 30p. The proposed difference would be £2. A few shoppers will pay but the majority will migrate to the short-stay section. **Weekly Tickets £10** (down from £11.50) **Low Emissions £8** (down from £10). Many shop and office workers are not highly paid but they are key to the continued success of the town centre economy. Weekly tickets are 24/7. There are no changes planned for tariffs in either section at weekends.*

In addition, I propose restoring the pedestrian path between the residential streets of Bishops Road/Blomfield Street and the Springfield/Tayfen area beyond, which was arbitrarily truncated last summer without consultation with either local ward members or the community which it served as a link to Wilko and the arc shopping centre. Most importantly, open discussions with West Suffolk College and Suffolk County Council to accommodate students

Monday to Friday during term time in the long-stay section. Here also, the implementation date would be Monday 3 April 2017.

Councillor Nettleton provided the Committee with additional supporting evidence regarding car parking statistics and the reasoning for the motion.

The Committee received Report No: OAS/SE17/001, which responded to various parts of the motion for consideration by members.

Councillor Peter Stevens, Portfolio Holder for Operations briefly set the scene regarding car parking and the work carried out by the Car Park Task and Finish Group in 2016, and their findings/recommendations which had been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. In response to the motion, he explained that the Council would need to look at the whole of the parking in the Borough, and not one car park in isolation. An add hoc review on one particular car park would not be healthy. The issue of college students parking on the roads was a matter for Suffolk County Council (SCC). He also acknowledged the current work taking place on the Bury Masterplan, which would be identifying future car parking needs.

The Car Parks Manager responded to the various issues raised in the motion. He briefly set out the car parking profile for the St Andrews car park and explained that there was no difference in parking profile when compared with other car parks in the Bury town centre. He provided information on the mid-week profile for parking numbers, and explained that tariffs often had little bearing on people using the car park. He explained that it was not about the cost of parking but about the most convenient place to park. The proposed increase in the long stay tariff at St Andrews car park was likely to further encourage long stay displacement to Ram Meadow and might encourage more users to purchase a 3 hour maximum stay ticket in the short stay section. Furthermore, a significant increase in tariff would adversely impact on part-time workers for whom a weekly ticket was not a viable option. A decrease in either tariff for weekly or the low emission weekly tickets would also encourage displacement from Ram Meadow car park, which deviated from the recent Car Parking Review recommendations supported by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Discussions were taking place between all parties involved regarding the issue of student parking.

The Chairman of the Committee opened the questioning by stating that she was appreciative of the work carried out by the Task and Finish Group. Some members who had sat on the Task and Finish Group then questioned why Cllr Nettleton was now bringing forward proposed tariff rises and not as part of the Task and Finish Group work carried out last year; and felt that further changes should not be made to car parking until the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Master plan consultation was completed.

The Committee then considered the evidence provided by Councillor David Nettleton along with the report. In particular the Committee considered in detail the existing tariff structure, specifically the all-day tariff for long stay parking, and whether the previous alignment of the footpath in the car park should be reinstated (with a requisite loss of car parking spaces).

Some members were broadly supportive of the motion and keeping the "status quo". However, it felt that the Council should not be afraid of tariffs being raised to solve solutions.

With regards to the footpath, the Committee was concerned that people might get hit in the St Andrews Car Park and suggested that the original footpath should be reinstated. However, some members felt that there was no need to reinstate the original alignment of the foot path. Other members were also concerned that no consultation had been carried out with the ward member(s) and sought reassurance that in the future ward member(s) would be consulted before changes were made in their ward.

The Chairman of the Committee informed members that the footpath did meet the required health and safety requirements, as set out in the report. The Portfolio Holder advised that this was the only car park in Bury St Edmunds which had a footpath. However, it was not a designated right of way and both drivers and people using the car park had a duty of care.

With regards to student parking, the Committee had some sympathy with college students, and was pleased that parties were coming together regarding student parking.

Summing up the Portfolio Holder acknowledged the need for further car park capacity to be reviewed and informed the Committee that he had been reassured through the master plan process that capacity could be delivered by 2020. He was also aware of members concerns and the Council was working hard to deliver solutions.

The Committee noted the motion and the contents of the report.

It was proposed by Councillor Andrew Speed and seconded by Angela Rushen, and with the vote being 14 for, 1 against, it was:

RECOMMENDED

That the all-day tariff for long stay parking in St Andrews Car Park, should not be changed, and that the Annual Update Report on Car Parking, usually presented to the Committee in November be moved to January 2018, following the completion of the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Master Plan.

It was proposed by Councillor Jim Thorndyke and seconded by Simon Brown, and with the vote being 7 for, 3 against and 5 abstentions, it was:

RECOMMENDED

That the previous alignment of the footpath in the St Andrews Car Park, should be reinstated, with the requisite loss of car parking spaces.

130. **Designated Public Place Orders in Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill and Change to Public Space Protection Orders**

[Councillor Clive Springett left at 5.30pm during the consideration and before voting to place on this item]

Councillor Robert Everitt, Cabinet Member for Families and Communities and Councillor Joanna Rayner, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture presented Report No: OAS/SE/17/002, which updated Councillors on legislation relating to Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) and proposed changes prior to public consultation. The report set out the transition arrangements from Designated Public Place Orders (DPPOs) to PSPOs; existing DPPO for Haverhill which had been in place since 2008; existing DPPO for Bury St Edmunds which had been in place since 2006; transition from Dogs Fouling of Land Act 1996 to PSPO Dog Control Orders; consultation requirements; publication of signage; enforcement; and reviews of PSPOs.

The Committee considered the report in detail and asked a number of questions of the Portfolio Holders and officers, to which comprehensive responses were provided.

In particular discussions were held on the inclusion of "street begging" within the Order as some members had concerns about distinguishing between "passive begging" and "aggressive begging". It was felt that people who were on the streets needed help with signposting and not being moved on; it would stop acts of charity; it would be giving out the right message; and felt it should not just include Bury St Edmunds as the issues might simply be moved elsewhere.

Councillor Robert Everitt informed the Committee that the request had come from the Police and businesses in Bury St Edmunds with regards to curbing begging. The Council was trying to be considerate towards those be found themselves begging for whatever reason and explained that there were places in Bury St Edmunds for people to go for help; shelter and food and that signposting was in place. Street Link had a free phone number to help rough sleepers and also a web site with information (tel: 0300 500 0914, www.streetlink.org.uk). No requests had been received from the Police in Haverhill to include begging in the PSPO covering the town. However, there would be opportunities in the future to include Haverhill should this be felt necessary. Officers also agreed to look at the wording around "passive" and "aggressive" begging.

The Committee also discussed in detail the dog orders. Members were in support of the dog order, but felt that there needed to be more emphasis on enforcement; dog wardens; the provision of dog bags at strategic locations; and whether anyone had been prosecuted.

In response, Councillor Rayner informed the Committee the council had dog bags which could be extended across other areas; five fixed penalty notices had been issued in St Edmundsbury over the last year, which had all resulted from information being reported by the public; signage would be increased as it was a requirement of the new PSPO; and the Council was committed to carrying out pilots with parish councils in order to reduce dog instances of

inconsiderate dog owners who do not pick up. However, the council and the community needed to work together in partnership to reduce the emotive subject of dog fouling.

The Committee noted that the Haverhill alcohol-related PSPO remained in place, with no changes to the conditions or the area covered.

It was then proposed by Councillor Frank Warby and seconded by Richard Rout, and with the vote being 12 for and 2 against, it was:

RECOMMENDED:

The inclusion of street begging in the Bury St Edmunds alcohol-related Public Space Protection Orders, be approved, subject to public consultation.

It was then proposed by Councillor Richard Rout and seconded by Paul Hopfensperger, and with the vote being unanimous, it was:

RECOMMENDED:

The Public Space Protection Orders relating to dog control across St Edmundsbury, be approved, subject to public consultation.

131. Bury St Edmunds Bus Station Information Building - Background Information

The Cabinet Member for Families and Communities presented Report No: OAS/SE/17/003, which provided background to the capital investment to reconfigure the Bury St Edmunds bus station information building to achieve revenue savings and additional income.

The report included information on the project background; invest to save; café kiosk update; lettable space update and bus information (planning and publishing bus timetable information, which is the responsibility of Suffolk County Council). The Head of Families and Communities clarified that the Café kiosk closed in June 2016, and not July 2016 as set out in the report.

The Committee considered the report in detail and asked a number of questions of the Cabinet Member and officers, to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on the lettable space currently available and the vending machines. The Cabinet Member informed members that enquiries were being made regarding the lettable space at the front of the building and hoped this would be occupied in early 2017. The vending machines now had stickers on them so any issues could be reported to the supplier.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the contents of the report.

132. **Review of Abbeycroft Leisure Ltd Performance 2005-2016**

[Councillor John Burns declared a pecuniary interest as a 30% shareholder in a competing leisure business, and left the meeting prior to the consideration and voting on this item.

Councillor Richard Rout declared a pecuniary interest as a owner of a competing leisure business, and left the meeting prior to the consideration and voting on this item.

Councillors Angela Rushen and Frank Warby left the meeting at 5.50pm prior to the consideration of this item.

Councillor Jim Thorndyke left the meeting at 6.30pm prior to voting]

The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture presented Report No: OAS/SE/17/004, which requested that members review the performance of Abbeycroft Leisure in St Edmundsbury, which would then inform the development of a new Partnership Agreement.

The report included information on the establishment of Abbeycroft Leisure; trustees and governance (Appendix 1); core business for West Suffolk; attendance levels; continuous improvement and quality management; initiatives and projects; business development and diversification; financial performance; strategic leisure support and advice; approaches and cost of other local authorities; challenges and the future.

Warren Smyth, Chief Operating Officer for Abbeycroft Leisure gave a short PowerPoint Presentation which showcased the activities of Abbeycroft Leisure over the last 10 years.

The Committee considered the report in detail and asked a number of questions of the Cabinet Member, Warren Smyth and officers, to which comprehensive responses were provided.

Discussions were held on the investment fund created in December 2016; health programmes for the elderly; working with partners in rural areas; new funding opportunities for sports in rural areas; reducing the management fee; Abbeycroft Leisure broadening its remit in all areas of sport, including mainstream sports; and outcomes from the Stand Tall project.

In particular Members discussed:

- The optimum length in developing a partnership agreement, and sought clarification as why this was not a tender process.
- The size and adequacy of the Bury St Edmunds swimming pool; opportunities to open the pool area to the outside; and the opportunity for spectator seating at the athletics track.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee wished to thank Abbeycroft Leisure for the work they had done, and noted the development and improvement of facilities over the years.

It was then proposed by Councillor Paul Hopfensperger and seconded by Andrew Speed, and with the vote being unanimous, it was:

RECOMMENDED

That note be taken of the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in developing a new Partnership Agreement with Abbeycroft moving forward, in particular:

- 1) The need for full transparency in costs to the Council of providing leisure services.**
- 2) The need for the agreement to focus on the outcomes for the health and wellbeing of communities.**
- 3) The approach to developing a Partnership Agreement with Abbeycroft for at least 10 years and alignment of leases will deliver value for money service for the Council.**

133. Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture

[Councillors John Burns and Richard Rout returned to the meeting at 6.40pm]

As set out in the Council's Constitution, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member would be invited to attend to give an account of his or her portfolio and answer questions from the Committee. Therefore, to carry out this constitutional requirement, members were asked to consider the responsibilities of the Cabinet Member for Operations, who had been invited to the meeting.

The Committee was reminded that on 13 January 2016, the Committee received a presentation from the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture, setting out responsibilities covered under the portfolio.

At this meeting, the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture had been invited to the meeting to provide a follow-up presentation on her portfolio. Report No: OAS/SE/17/005 set out the focus of the follow-up presentation, which was to:

- Outline the main challenges faced during the first year;
- Outline some key successes and any failures during the first year and any lessons learned; and
- Set out the vision for the Portfolio through to 2019, and whether on target to meet that vision.

Councillor Joanna Rayner opened her verbal update by thanking the Committee for the invitation. The update included information on staff structure and the financial breakdown of the leisure and cultural budget for 2016-2017. A number of examples also were provided, outlining the achievements; aims for 2017 and service challenges, such as:

- Success in Anglia In Bloom (achievement)
- Play area refurbishments (achievement);
- Sports Award 2016 (achievement);
- The Apex – over 200 live shows (achievement)
- Increase visitor numbers at Moyse's Hall and West Stow (aim);
- Help establish the Destination Management Organisation (aims)
- Maintaining standards whilst reducing costs (challenge);
- Green Space Management – increase in invasive pests and diseases (challenge)

Members discussed the update in detail and asked a number of questions of the Cabinet Member for Leisure and Culture and officers, to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on cemeteries and their capacity in the short and long-term; refurbishment of play areas and the Sodexo contract.

In response to questions:

- i) The Cabinet Member agreed to look into the possibility of taking over the playing fields at Chalkstone Middle School in Haverhill, which was closed.
- ii) Officers agreed to send members the updated schedule on the maintenance of play areas and would consult with ward members when play areas were due for maintenance.

The Committee wished to thank all staff, particularly those involved in increasing the visitor numbers to West Stow over the last year.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for the follow-up update on her portfolio.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the presentation.

134. **Review and Revision of the Constitution**

As set out in the Council's Constitution, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis would receive a report from the Monitoring Officer setting out minor amendments made arising from changes to legislation; changes to staffing structures/job descriptions or changes in terminology.

Report No: OAS/SE/17/006 set out minor amendments which had been undertaken by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority from October to December 2016.

The Committee was advised that all Members of the Council had also been informed of the minor amendments as part of the ongoing review and revision of the Constitution.

The Committee considered the report, and there being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the minor amendments undertaken by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.

135. Directed Surveillance Authorised Applications (Quarter 3)

The Regulation of Investigatory Powers (Directed Surveillance and Covert Human Intelligence Sources) Order 2010 required that Members should scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.

The Monitoring Officer had advised that in Quarter 3, no such surveillance had been authorised. Therefore, there being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, Quarter 3 update.

136. Work Programme Update

The Committee received Report No: OAS/SE/17/007, which updated Members on the current status of its rolling work programme of items for scrutiny during 2017 (Appendix 1).

The Committee considered its work programme, and requested the item on the "North West Relief Road and Haverhill Town Centre Master Plan" to be included on the agenda for March 2017. It was felt valuable lessons could be learnt for the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Master Plan which was currently out to consultation; and the first planning application for phase 1 for the north-west Haverhill development was imminent and the delivery of the north west relief road was crucial for the sustainability of the proposed north-west and north-east developments. The Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) agreed to discuss with relevant officers.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the contents of the report.

137. Exempt Appendix 3 - Review of Abbeycroft Leisure Ltd Performance 2005 - 2016

The Committee received and **noted** Exempt Appendix 3 to Report No: OAS/SE/17/004. However, as no reference was made to specific detail, this item was not discussed in private session.

The Meeting concluded at 7.15 pm

Signed by:

Chairman

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance	
Report No:	OAS/SE/17/008	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	15 March 2017
Portfolio Holder:	Ian Houlder Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance Tel: 01284 810074 Email: ian.hould@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	<p>As part of the "Challenge" role, Overview and Scrutiny are asked to consider the roles and responsibilities of Cabinet Members. It is part of the Scrutiny role to challenge in the form of questions.</p> <p>Therefore, to carry out this constitutional requirement, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall attend to give an account of his or her portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.</p>	
Recommendation:	Members of the Committee are asked to question the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance on his portfolio responsibilities.	
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:	• N/A		
Alternative option(s):	• N/A		
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
Are there any staffing implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
Are there any ICT implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
Are there any equality implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
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)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
None			
Wards affected:		All	
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

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 As part of its "Challenge" role, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the roles and responsibilities of Cabinet Members.
- 1.1.2 To carry out this constitutional requirement, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall be invited to give an account of his or her portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
- 1.1.3 On 9 March 2016, the Committee received a presentation from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Ian Houlder, summarising the following responsibilities covered under his portfolio for resources and performance:
- Business development/commercial;
 - Cabinet management and support;
 - Civic office (Mayor);
 - Democratic services (including members' support);
 - Financial services (including audit);
 - Health and safety;
 - Human resources (including payroll);
 - ICT;
 - Learning and development;
 - Legal services;
 - Performance and risk management;
 - Procurement;
 - Scrutiny management and support.

1.2 Progress Update

- 1.2.1 At this meeting, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance has been invited back to provide a follow-up update on his portfolio.

The presentation by the Cabinet Member will be focusing on the following by:

- Outlining the main challenges which were faced during the first year within the Portfolio:
- Outlining some key successes and any failures during the first year and any lessons learned?
- Setting out the vision for the Resources and Performance Portfolio through to 2019 and whether on target to meet that vision?

1.3 Proposals

- 1.3.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee ask questions of the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, following his update.

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Update on Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan and North West Relief Road, Haverhill	
Report No:	OAS/SE/17/009	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	15 March 2017
Portfolio holder:	Cllr Alaric Pugh Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Tel: 07930 460899 Email: Alaric.pugh@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officers:	Kirsty Pitwood Principal Growth Officer Tel: 01284 757109 Email: Kirsty.pitwood@westsuffolk.gov.uk Chris Rand Principal Planning Officer Tel: 01284 757352 Email: Chris.rand@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To update Members on the Haverhill Masterplan and the North West Relief Road, Haverhill.	
Recommendation:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that: (1) Members <u>note</u> the update on the Haverhill Masterplan; and (2) Members <u>note</u> the update on the North West Relief Road.	
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <u>do not</u> apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Consultation:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production of the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan included two sets of formal public consultation. • The North West Relief Road was subject to consultation at policy formulation stage, preparation of the masterplan and consideration of the planning application. 	
Alternative option(s):		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alternative option could have been to not produce a Town Centre Masterplan. However this would have been contrary to policy as stipulated in the Haverhill Vision 2031 document. • Without the relief road, future growth of Haverhill would be limited. • Without the implementation of Local Plan commitments to planning inspector-led approved housing site allocations, there would be no need for the relief road and no mechanism for delivery. 	
Implications:			
Are there any financial implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Nothing as a result of this report	
Are there any staffing implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Nothing as a result of this report	
Are there any ICT implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Nothing as a result of this report	
Are there any legal and/or policy implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Nothing as a result of this report	
Are there any equality implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> • Nothing as a result of this report	
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)
The Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan is not delivered	Medium	The One Haverhill Implementation Working Group regularly meet and are governed by One Haverhill Partnership Board	Low
The extant planning permission is not taken up and the relief road is not delivered	Low	Any future planning application would be required to accommodate any growth in traffic	Low
Ward(s) affected:		All Haverhill Wards	

<p>Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i></p>	<p>Haverhill Vision 2031 - https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/local_plans/upload/2-Haverhill-2031.pdf</p> <p>Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan - http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/haverhillmasterplan</p> <p>Development Control Committee, 5 June 2014 (Paper F25)</p>
<p>Documents attached:</p>	<p>N/A</p>

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations

1.1 Role of The One Haverhill Partnership in the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplanning process

1.1.1 Due to its role as Local Planning Authority, and the fact that the Masterplan is a Supplementary Planning Document, St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) has an overarching role, and the legal responsibility, for the masterplanning process. However, The One Haverhill Partnership (TOHP) led in the production of the town centre masterplan document and continues to lead in the implementation of the masterplan – this is to ensure co-production/delivery with key stakeholders in the town centre. This was a ground-breaking move by SEBC, recognising the role that communities have in planning their future as per the localism agenda. With TOHP Haverhill had a mechanism perfectly suited to taking on this responsibility.

1.1.2 TOHP formed a Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan Working Group (HTCMWG) at the start of the masterplanning process (August 2014), with the support of officers from the town, borough and county council. The group met on a fortnightly basis to ensure that every stage of the process was closely monitored and delivered effectively, and provided minutes of its actions to the TOHP Board. Representatives on the group were drawn from organisations able to provide the most commitment to the process:

- a) Havebury Housing Partnership
- b) Haverhill Chamber of Commerce
- c) Haverhill Town Council
- d) St Edmundsbury Borough Council; and
- e) Suffolk County Council.

1.1.3 After the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan was adopted in September 2015, TOHP Board agreed that a Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan Implementation Working Group (HTCMIWG) was required. SEBC and Haverhill Town Council agreed to provide substantial levels of officer support to enable successful implementation over the next ten years. It was recognised that this was a long term process, requiring long term resources. Early on in its deliberations, the HTCMIWG secured a long term commitment from Suffolk County Council (SCC) Highways to work with it at all stages of implementation. Initially, this group met on a quarterly basis, but later it has agreed to meet approximately monthly (or as and when individual project updates are required) in order to maintain momentum. Representative organisations on the group remained the same, although actual membership changed. The current members of the HTCMIWG are:

- a) Havebury Housing Partnership – Philip Sullivan
- b) Haverhill Chamber of Commerce – John Mayhew
- c) Haverhill Town Council – Cllr David Roach (also Borough councillor) and Colin Poole (Town Clerk)
- d) St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Cllr Alaric Pugh (Chair); and
- e) Suffolk County Council - Cllr John Burns (also Town and Borough councillor).

- 1.1.4 There is an expectation that all members of the HTCMIWG will provide updates to their Haverhill colleagues, as appropriate.
- 1.1.5 The mechanism by which the masterplan document was delivered was provided by TOHP Board, who meet quarterly and receive updates on the masterplan. TOHP itself is a board of boards and is scrutinised by the boards of all the organisations that send representatives to it. It is to be recorded that all members of TOHP offer their participation on the basis of the constitution of TOHP, which stresses the a-political nature of the organisation.
- 1.2 **Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan process - production of the masterplan document**
- 1.2.1 The Haverhill Vision 2031 Local Plan document was adopted by SEBC Full Council in September 2014. That document concluded that it could not do justice to the long term issues affecting the town centre. It therefore proposed that a town centre masterplan be developed at a later date, in consultation with the many businesses, representative groups and interests that operate within, or rely on, the town centre. Accordingly, Policy HV19 required the production of a masterplan.
- 1.2.2 The Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan document was duly begun. Unusually, in the world of masterplans, it was produced over a period of approximately one year, starting in August 2014 and finishing in September 2015. This was only possible because of the substantial historical masterplanning that had been undertaken in Haverhill, in addition to the two years of consultation and workshops undertaken with the community by SCC.
- 1.2.3 Following a competitive procurement process, planning and urban design specialists, David Lock Associates (DLA), were appointed to work with SEBC in partnership with TOHP to produce the masterplan. DLA brought considerable experience of best practice masterplanning from across the country.
- 1.2.4 The task of the HTCMWG for many weeks, supported by SEBC's lead officer, was to develop the most appropriate and extremely detailed brief for the consultants. This work was then used to develop the following stages of the process:
- a) *Stage 1: Analysis and baseline review* – this involved reviewing a library of documents relevant to the town centre which formed the evidence base for the masterplan going forward.
 - b) *Stage 1a: Presentation of initial findings* – the consultants reported to the Working Group and updates were given to the Haverhill Area Working Party and SEBC Cabinet.
 - c) *Stage 2: Preparation of issues and options report* – a report and questionnaire was produced in readiness for public consultation.
 - d) *Stage 2a: Issues and options consultation period* (6 weeks) – a period of consultation, engagement and participation with stakeholders; through drop-in sessions, events, leaflet drops, questionnaires, and so on.
 - e) *Stage 3: Production of draft masterplan* – following analysis of

- consultation the draft was produced.
- f) *Stage 3b: Draft masterplan consultation period* (6 weeks) - a period of consultation, engagement and participation with stakeholders; through drop-in sessions, events, leaflet drops, questionnaires, and so on.
 - g) *Stage 4: Finalise masterplan* - following analysis of consultation the final document was produced.
 - h) *Stage 5: Handover* – this included adopting and launching the masterplan.
- 1.2.5 Throughout the process, in addition to reporting and seeking approval from the HTCMTWG, reports were taken to Leadership Team, Cabinet and SEBC Council as appropriate.
- 1.2.6 All the agreed timescales were met and the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan was adopted by SEBC in September 2015.
- 1.2.7 Alongside the formal process above, uniquely for masterplans, and in order to increase community engagement and participation, the HTCMTWG organised a number of community projects with a focus on the town centre including:
- a) Community 'Give CB9 a Shine' clean-up days, organised by Haverhill Town Council on behalf of One Haverhill and supported by the Haverhill Weekly News.
 - b) Development of a 'Historic Haverhill' leaflet to highlight some of the sometimes hidden historic architectural gems within the town.
 - c) Empty shop displays, led by the Haverhill Chamber of Commerce (although we are pleased to report that these have largely been unused due to a low vacancy rate).
 - d) Uplighting: A project to provide uplighting to highlight some of the town centres attractive and iconic buildings and structures.
- 1.2.8 These projects continue to be developed and are regarded as another method of promoting the masterplan.
- 1.2.9 New projects are being developed through the implementation of the masterplan.
- 1.3 **Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan process – implementing the adopted masterplan**
- 1.3.1 The town centre masterplan includes actions/opportunities on strategic sites, movement and public realm. Each action/opportunity was given an indicative timescale – for example short (approximately 5 years), medium (approximately 10 years) or long term (more than 10 years).
- 1.3.2 The HTCMTWG and SEBC officers further prioritised these actions in terms of those which we can directly control and influence, those our partners can control and directly influence, and those that we/our partners are unable to control but can seek to influence.
- 1.3.3 Several actions are currently being progressed, supported by officers from the town, borough and county councils. For some projects, a lead is agreed

from within the working group.

- 1.3.4 Updates on the current actions are provided at each HTCMIWG meeting and next steps discussed and agreed. On occasions, it is necessary to have a meeting solely dedicated to an individual action.

1.4 **Key issues and challenges**

- 1.4.1 There have been, and are still, a number of issues and challenges. These are outlined below:

- a) There is an expectation amongst some that the actions/opportunities can be completed in a short time scale and there is frustration at the apparent slow pace of delivery. However, the town centre masterplan covers the period to 2031 (to link to the Vision 2031 documents). The challenge for us is to manage expectations and explain that we will not/cannot achieve the masterplan's aims overnight; nor will the market let us.
- b) We would like to be able to regularly promote the delivery of the masterplan to the public to show that work is happening, however there are a number of reasons why this is difficult – for example:
 - i. The majority of current actions are at an early feasibility stage. We cannot go public with this information until we are certain on the final options as we would 'set hares running' unnecessarily.
 - ii. Some of the actions are commercially sensitive.
 - iii. The pace of the actions, as explained in a) above, means that it is very difficult to show tangible progress on a short term regular basis.
- c) SEBC and partners are committed to individual actions and projects to support delivery as and when feasibility, business cases and costs are established. This is an ongoing commitment to achieve delivery.

1.5

Lessons to be learnt for the other West Suffolk masterplans

1.5.1

There are lots of things that have *worked well* with the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan process and will be replicated for other masterplans. For example:

- a) *Co-production*. Due to the existence of TOHP, we were able to co-produce the masterplan and it was therefore recognised by the public as coming from Haverhill (rather than the traditional method of producing the masterplan where it is written and consulted on). We will continue to use the co-production approach. For example in Bury St Edmunds, where the production of a masterplan is now underway, we have formed a co-production group which includes representatives from the town, borough and county councils, Abbey of St Edmund Heritage Partnership, Bury Market Trader Association, Bury Society, Bury Town Trust, the Cathedral and Our Burystedmunds Business Improvement District.

- b) *Early pre formal consultation engagement.* In Haverhill shortly before the start of the masterplan process, lots of engagement work on the future of the town centre had taken place, managed by SCC and led by Kevin Murray Associates. The results of this information were made available for our masterplan consultants to use as part of their evidence base. Whilst we did not have the benefit of this type of work for Bury St Edmunds, the town already had a recent history of studies, reports and research, together with local knowledge. This dates back to the arc development, progressing through the strong engagement of many community-focussed organisations, and most recently, the commissioning of reports for, and by, the Business Improvement District. SEBC also undertook to update some of its own data. Additionally, we have decided to add in our own early consultation engagement (it should result in a more robust final masterplan). For example, in Bury St Edmunds we created an Accessibility consultation group (11 organisations representing people with additional needs who live, work, shop and visit Bury St Edmunds town centre; including Age UK Suffolk, Bury Dementia Action Alliance, Bury Youth Forum, Suffolk Coalition of Disabled People, Suffolk Deaf Association, Suffolk Family Carers and West Suffolk Blind Association). We also created a Bury Assembly of Associations consultation group (the 11 residents' associations operating within the Town Council boundary area). Furthermore, we are working with Suffolk MIND to see how the masterplan can address mental health and wellbeing. We would seek to do similar for the remaining West Suffolk masterplans.
- c) *Role of communities in consultation process.* Due to early engagement, by the working group and officers, with the public in the form of lots of face to face drop-ins, events, flyer drops and so on, we received an excellent response rate to our two formal consultation periods. We have replicated this for Bury St Edmunds and would seek to do so for the remaining West Suffolk masterplans.
- d) *Use of social media.* TOHP used social media to a great extent during the production of the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan, something that SEBC has not previously used for Masterplanning. This use of social media was successful in gaining interest from the public in the masterplan (though did need to be managed carefully, with factually incorrect information being responded to as far as possible). For the Bury St Edmunds Issues and Options masterplan consultation which was recently launched, we too are using social media to our benefit.
- e) *Stages in producing the masterplan.* The stages outlined in paragraph 1.2.4 were proven to be the right way forward. As such, we have exactly replicated these stages for Bury St Edmunds and envisage doing to for the remaining West Suffolk masterplans.
- f) *Funding.* While, because of its statutory duty, the local planning authority provided significant core funding, the sponsor in the form of TOHP played a funding role and where possible member organisations provided 'buy-in' funding (either in cash, for example the Town Council gave £20k, or in kind). This same successful model has been

followed in Bury St Edmunds.

1.5.2 There are some things that have *not worked so well* and so we will look to learn lessons. For example:

- a) *Action plan*. This would have benefitted from being clearer to aid implementation. For example, we should have stipulated that the consultants prioritise the projects. The HTCMIWG acknowledged the need to look afresh at the actions to provide clarity going forward and more effective management of the actions. A decision has been made to split the actions into five workstreams (heading description is draft at this stage), each workstream to have a working group lead:
 - i. *Workstream 1: Highways and movement* - Delivery of highway improvements
 - ii. *Workstream 2: Marketing* - Advertising Haverhill and marketing specific sites
 - iii. *Workstream 3: Site assembly* - Getting control, investing, influencing
 - iv. *Workstream 4: Development briefs* - Creation of briefs from planning perspective - what are rules for sites? What constraints need to be put on?
 - v. *Workstream 5: Place management* - Town and borough council day job

Under each workstream more detail will be given in terms of resources, budget, timescales, and so on.

We have asked that the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre masterplan Action Plan must:

- i. identify short, medium and long term actions including interdependencies between the actions and desired outcomes;
 - ii. prioritise the actions according to appropriate criteria;
 - iii. identify how each action should be implemented – e.g. identify potential delivery mechanisms, resources (both financial and non-financial) required, funding sources, who should deliver the action; and who the key stakeholders are; and
 - iv. take strong account of market demand for development, and indicate viability of private sector investment.
- b) *Timescales*. Whilst we met the timescales for the production of the masterplan, at times they were very tight. We should consider not publishing consultation period dates publically until much nearer the time (for Bury St Edmunds we therefore said the Issues and Options consultation would be in the Spring rather than giving specific dates). For Bury St Edmunds we have told the public we hope to complete the masterplan by the end of 2017. It is more important that we get the engagement and the solutions right rather than hit a deadline. We should perhaps review giving an end date for the remaining West Suffolk masterplans in case unexpected delays occur.

- c) *Promotion*. Whilst there is an understanding and an expectation that members of the HTCMIWG update colleagues, we acknowledge that this perhaps does not always happen in a timely fashion. We will therefore recognise that email updates should be provided on a regular basis to supplement the conversations, briefings and broader opportunities to discuss progress.
- d) *Communications*. Significant communications support was provided for the first stage of the masterplan by TOHP and significant community engagement resulted. However, in hindsight, it was felt that if more resources had been available they could have been well used to publicise the process further and underpin the implementation stage. As a result, the HTCMIWG is ensuring that more communications resources are found at this stage. This issue has been resolved for the Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Masterplan.

1.6 North West relief road, Haverhill

- 1.6.1 The NW relief road is completely outside the scope of the Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan and all associated processes. However, significant housing growth in Haverhill is planned for in Haverhill Vision 2031, the Local Plan document. Without this significant growth, the current Haverhill Town Centre Masterplan will not be able to be implemented. Previous Haverhill Masterplans have failed when economic conditions have affected the delivery of planned growth.
- 1.6.2 A relief road to serve NW Haverhill was first identified in the Gibberd Plan of 1971 running from the A1307 east of Meldham Bridge to the A143 close to Boyton Hall. A significant portion of this road was built to serve development south of Boyton Hall and now forms Ann Suckling Road. Further development to the west of this road did not take place until an application was submitted in 2001.
- 1.6.3 In 2001 an application was made for residential development to the west of Howe Road for 393 dwellings with associated roads and infrastructure (application SE/01/3365/P). This application included the eastern end of the Relief Road which has since been built. This development all fed onto Withersfield Road and was restricted to 400 dwellings due to the restriction created by the Cangle Junction between the site and the town centre. At that time, prior to the construction of the Tesco supermarket, Cangle Junction was a double mini roundabout which caused major congestion. Following construction of Tesco, the road configuration was altered and a new road provided to the north of properties in Lordscroft Lane, enabling two separate roundabouts to be constructed with a road between them. This provided significant additional capacity.
- 1.6.4 The 2001 application identified significant local opposition to the relief road linking with Ann Suckling Road and this prompted consideration of a new line for the road opening the opportunity for additional development. This was incorporated into the 2006 Replacement Local Plan. Had that change not been made in response to local concern, the relief road would have connected with Ann Suckling Road and would probably have been completed some years ago.

- 1.6.5 Having established a new route for the road, linking with the A143 in the vicinity of the Fox Public House, a masterplan was prepared for the delivery of the development including the road. This was prepared in consultation with, and the participation of, local residents. The masterplan was adopted by the council in June 2009. A planning application for the construction of the road and 1150 houses, school and other associated infrastructure was submitted later that year (application SE/09/1283).
- 1.6.6 In 2010 the Council adopted its Core Strategy following an examination in Public led by a government appointed inspector. This document confirmed the previous allocation for 1150 houses and the relief road (Policy CS12).
- 1.6.7 In 2014 the Council adopted the Haverhill Vision 2031 Local Plan document. Again, it was adopted following an inspector led examination in public. This again confirmed the designation of the NW Strategic development incorporating the relief road (Policy HV3). Policy HV12 states "The delivery and timing of the Relief Road will be controlled through a legal agreement attached to any planning permission for that development".
- 1.6.8 Consideration of the planning application submitted in 2009 had stalled following the economic downturn and serious concerns about viability. Serious discussion resumed in September 2013 following growth in the property market. Earlier discussions had proposed a reduction in the overall contributions towards other infrastructure requirements including affordable housing in order to deliver the relief road. However, following independent valuation advice and evidence of higher yields, we were able to demonstrate that the road could be delivered without significant reduction of other primary infrastructure requirements.
- 1.6.9 The following two paragraphs are lifted directly from the report to the Development Control Committee at its meeting on 5 June 2014 (Paper F25) when the application was considered:
- a) Paragraph 49:
- "The timing of the delivery of the relief road has been the subject of protracted detailed discussion between the applicant, your officers and the Highway Authority (Suffolk County Council). Originally it was intended that the road should be delivered before any other part of the development. However, this would require significant expenditure before any income had been received from the sale of houses. This in turn would have had a significant impact upon the viability of the whole development reducing the potential to provide other essential infrastructure. The need for early provision of the road has also been affected by the completion of improvements to the Cangle junction in the centre of Haverhill, following development of the Tesco store. This resolved earlier capacity issues at this junction that would have prevented any development on the application site from coming forward. This matter has been resolved by providing a time limit of 5 years to complete the road following commencement of the development. This would be guaranteed by a bond which would fund the completion of the road, should it not be completed within 5 years."*

b) Paragraph 57:

"S106 contributions: As a strategic development the proposal is liable for a range of S106 contributions. These are listed for clarity as follows:

- 30% affordable housing across the site*
- Education provision for early years, primary and secondary*
- Library provision*
- Provision and maintenance of open space and play facilities*
- Contribution towards off-site leisure facilities*
- Contribution towards health provision*
- Off site pedestrian and cycle improvements*
- Contribution towards public transport provision and real time passenger information screens*
- Bond to ensure completion of the relief road*
- Funding of travel plan and provision of a travel plan bond."*

1.6.10 The S106 was accepted by all parties and planning permission was granted and remains extant. Consequently, there is a robust mechanism in place to deliver this important road, the cost of which will be derived from the value of the land.

1.6.11 Since the granting of planning permission, Persimmon Homes has taken an interest in the site. Discussions have been taking place between all parties and the first application for a submission of details has been formally submitted and is currently at consultation. Implementation of this development will trigger the delivery of the North West Relief Road. SEBC is working proactively with all parties to ensure that there are no unsurmountable constraints imposed on this process.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Title of Report:	Decisions Plan: March 2017 to May 2017	
Report No:	OAS/SE/17/010	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	15 March 2017
Portfolio Holder:	John Griffiths Leader of the Council Tel: 01284 757136 Email: john.griffiths@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead Officer:	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	<p>Attached as Appendix 1 is the Decisions Plan to be considered by Cabinet for the period March 2017 to May 2017.</p> <p>Items which had been added since the Decisions Plan was last published are shaded for Members convenience.</p> <p>Members are asked to note that the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, in most instances will receive reports on Audit and Governance related items published in the Decisions Plan.</p>	
Recommendation:	Members are invited to peruse the Decisions Plan for items on which they would like further information on, or which they feel might benefit from the Committee's involvement by completing the Member Work Programme Suggestion Form attached as Appendix 2.	
Documents attached:	Appendix 1 –Decisions Plan: March 2017 to May 2017 Appendix 2 – Member Suggestion Form	

This page is intentionally left blank



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Decisions Plan

Key Decisions and other executive decisions to be considered

Date: 1 March 2017 to 31 May 2017

Publication Date: 23 February 2017

The following plan shows both the key decisions and other decisions/matters taken in private, that the Cabinet, Joint Committees or Officers under delegated authority, are intending to take up to 31 May 2017 and beyond. This table is updated on a monthly rolling basis and provides at least 28 clear days' notice of the consideration of any key decisions and of the taking of any items in private.

Executive decisions are taken at public meetings of the Cabinet and by other bodies provided with executive decision-making powers. Some decisions and items may be taken in private during the parts of the meeting at which the public may be excluded, when it is likely that confidential or exempt information may be disclosed. This is indicated on the relevant meeting agenda and in the '*Reason for taking the item in private*' column relevant to each item detailed on the plan.

Members of the public may wish to:

- make enquiries in respect of any of the intended decisions listed below;
- receive copies of any of the documents in the public domain listed below;
- receive copies of any other documents in the public domain relevant to those matters listed below which may be submitted to the decision taker; or
- make representations in relation to why meetings to consider the listed items intended for consideration in private should be open to the public.

In all instances, contact should be made with the named Officer in the first instance, either on the telephone number listed against their name, or via email using the format firstname.surname@westsuffolk.gov.uk or via St Edmundsbury Borough Council, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33 3YU.

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
28/03/17 (Deferred from 7 February 2017) Page 30	Leisure Partnership Agreement The Cabinet will be asked to consider recommending to Council the adoption of a proposed new Partnership Agreement with Abbeycroft Leisure for the benefit of West Suffolk residents and businesses, having regard to West Suffolk's strategic leisure intentions.	Possible Exempt Appendix: Paragraph 3	(R) – Council 25/04/17	Cabinet/ Council	Joanna Rayner Leisure and Culture 07872 456836	Jill Korwin Director 01284 757252	All Wards	Report to Cabinet with recommendations to Council and possibility of exempt appendices
This item has currently been removed from the Decisions Plan	North East Bury St Edmunds Masterplan: Transport Assessment <u><i>This item has currently been removed from the Decisions Plan</i></u> as the Transport Assessment, which will form part of the planning application for the NE Bury St Edmunds strategic site, is unlikely to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority until autumn/winter 2017.				Alaric Pugh, Planning and Growth 07930 460899	Peter White Principal Planning Officer – Major Projects 01284 757357		

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
	Around that time, Members will be given the opportunity to receive a presentation from the developers on the Transport Assessment.							
31/05/17 Page 31	Revenues Collection Performance and Write Offs The Cabinet will be asked to consider writing-off outstanding debts, as detailed in the exempt appendices.	Paragraphs 1 and 2	(KD)	Cabinet	Ian Houlder Resources and Performance 01284 810074	Rachael Mann Assistant Director (Resources and Performance) 01638 719245	All Wards	Report to Cabinet with exempt appendices.
31/05/17 Deferred from 01/11/16	West Suffolk Information Strategy The Cabinet will be asked to consider the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and recommend to full Council, approval of a West Suffolk Information Strategy, which has been jointly produced with Forest Heath District Council.	Not applicable	Possibly (R) – Council June 2017	Cabinet/ Council	Ian Houlder Resources and Performance 01284 810074	Rachael Mann Assistant Director (Resources and Performance) 01638 719245	All Wards	Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Cabinet and Council.

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
31/05/17 (NEW) Page 62	Annual Review of Cabinet's Working Groups, Joint Committees/Panels and Other Groups Cabinet will be asked to consider an annual review of its Working Groups, Joint Committees/Panels and other Groups.	Not applicable	(D)	Cabinet	John Griffiths Leader of the Council 07958700434	Karen Points Assistant Director (HR, Legal and Democratic Services) 01284 757015	All Wards	Report to Cabinet.
31/05/17 Deferred from 28/03/17	Western Way Design and Development Brief The Cabinet will be asked to consider the Design and Development Brief that has been formulated around the principles within the adopted Masterplan for phase II of the Western Way Development Site Bury St Edmunds. The buildings within the development site will no doubt change as the detailed development requirements of each partner is finalised but the Design and	Possible exempt appendices – Paragraph 3	(R) – Council 13/06/17	Cabinet/Council	Alaric Pugh, Planning and Growth 07930 460899	Assistant Director (Growth) Rachael Mann Assistant Director (Resources and Performance) 01638 719295	All Wards	Report to Cabinet with recommendations to Council.

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
Page 33	Development Brief once approved can be used to demonstrate the design structure, density of development, establish build costs, the quality of the materials to be used together with how the development will relate to West Suffolk House and neighbouring land and uses. The Cabinet will be asked to note the interest shown by the various public and private bodies who have expressed their commitment to being part of this exciting project. The Cabinet will then be asked to recommend to Full Council that final approval be given to the delivery of Phase II of the Western Way Development site as envisaged by the Design and Development brief.							

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
27/06/17 (New)	West Suffolk Annual Report 2016/2017 <u>Following scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee</u> , the Cabinet will be asked to consider the West Suffolk Annual Report 2016/2017, which has been jointly produced with FHDC.	Not applicable	(D)	Cabinet	John Griffiths Leader of the Council 07958700434	Davina Howes Assistant Director (Families and Communities) 01284 757070	All Wards	Report to Cabinet.
27/06/17 (New)	West Suffolk Community Energy Plan-Update 2016/17 Following previous approval given for a capital allocation for the development of a rent-a-roof solar scheme for business, which was subsequently extended to support other specific investment schemes, the Cabinet will be asked to consider extending this allocation further to cover energy efficiency & renewable energy schemes delivering similar financial & environmental returns.	Not applicable	(D)	Cabinet	Alaric Pugh, Planning and Growth 07930 460899	Peter Gudde Acting Head of Regulatory Services 01284 757042	All Wards	Report to Cabinet.

NOTE 1: DEFINITIONS OF EXEMPT INFORMATION: RELEVANT PARAGRAPHS

In accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

The public may be excluded from all or part of the meeting during the consideration of items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information defined in Schedule 12(A) of the Act, as follows:

PART 1

DESCRIPTIONS OF EXEMPT INFORMATION: ENGLAND

1. Information relating to any individual.
2. Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual.
3. Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
4. Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.
5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.
6. Information which reveals that the authority proposes –
 - (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment.
7. Information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.

In accordance with Section 100A(3) (a) and (b) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

Confidential information is also not for public access, but the difference between this and exempt information is that a Government department, legal opinion or the court has prohibited its disclosure in the public domain. Should confidential information require consideration in private, this will be detailed in this Decisions Plan.

NOTE 2: KEY DECISION DEFINITION

- (a) A key decision means an executive decision which, pending any further guidance from the Secretary of State, is likely to:
 - (i) be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area in the Borough/District; or
 - (ii) result in any new expenditure, income or savings of more than £50,000 in relation to the Council's revenue budget or capital programme;
 - (iii) comprise or include the making, approval or publication of a draft or final scheme which may require, either directly or in the event of objections, the approval of a Minister of the Crown.
- (b) A decision taker may only make a key decision in accordance with the requirements of the Executive procedure rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.

NOTE 3: MEMBERSHIP OF BODIES MAKING KEY DECISIONS

(a) Membership of the Cabinet and their Portfolios:

Cabinet Member	Portfolio
Councillor John Griffiths Councillor Sara Mildmay-White	Leader of the Council Deputy Leader of the Council/ Housing
Councillor Robert Everitt Councillor Ian Houlder	Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance
Councillor Alaric Pugh Councillor Joanna Rayner Councillor Peter Stevens	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture Portfolio Holder for Operations

- (b) **Membership of the Anglia Revenues Partnership Joint Committee (Breckland Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Fenland District Council, Forest Heath District Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Waveney District Council)** (Membership amended from 1 December 2015 to one Member/two Substitutes per Authority)

Full Breckland Cabinet Member	Full East Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet Member	Full Fenland District Council Cabinet Member	Full Forest Heath District Council Cabinet Member	Full Suffolk Coastal District Council Cabinet Member	Full St Edmundsbury Borough Council Cabinet Member	Full Waveney District Council Cabinet Member
Cllr Pablo Dimoglou	Cllr David Ambrose-Smith	Cllr Chris Seaton	Cllr Stephen Edwards	Cllr Richard Kerry	Cllr Ian Houlder	Cllr Mike Barnard
Substitute Breckland Cabinet Members	Substitute East Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet Members	Substitute Fenland District Council Cabinet Members	Substitute Forest Heath District Council Cabinet Members	Substitute Suffolk Coastal District Council Cabinet Members	Substitute St Edmundsbury Borough Council Cabinet Members	Substitute Waveney District Council Cabinet Members
Cllr Michael Wassell	Cllr Lis Every	Cllr John Clark	Cllr James Waters	Cllr Geoff Holdcroft	Cllr Sara Mildmay-White	Cllr Sue Allen
Cllr Ellen Jolly	Cllr Julia Huffer	Cllr Will Sutton	Cllr David Bowman	Cllr Ray Herring	Cllr Robert Everitt	Cllr Letitia Smith

Karen Points
Assistant Director (Human Resources, Legal and Democratic Services)
Date: 23 February 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Who is responsible for providing this service, or tackling the issue in question?
.....
.....
.....
.....
Have you spoken to them, and if so, what was the response?
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
What is the Portfolio Holders view on this issue?
.....
.....
.....
What would be the likely benefits and outcomes of carrying out this investigation / review?
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
Estimated Committee and officer resource implications (eg research group, one-off report, dedicated meeting etc)
.....
.....
.....

Suggested witnesses, documentation and consultation	
.....	
.....	
.....	
.....	
Will this investigation / review contribute to one or more of the Council's Strategic Priorities? If so, which (please tick)	
Increased opportunities for economic growth	
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active	
Homes for our communities	

Will this investigation / review contribute to the achievement of one or more of the commitments within the Council's Strategic Plan 2014-2016? If so, which (please tick)	
Increased opportunities for economic growth:	
1. Benefit growth that enhances prosperity and quality of life.	
2. Existing businesses that are thriving and new businesses brought to the area.	
3. People with the educational attainment and skills needed in our local economy.	
4. Vibrant, attractive and clean high streets, village centres and markets.	
Resilient families and communities that are healthy and active:	
1. A thriving voluntary sector and active communities who take the initiative to help the most vulnerable.	
2. People playing a greater role in determining the future of their communities.	
3. Improved wellbeing, physical and mental health.	
4. Accessible countryside and green spaces.	
Homes for our communities:	
1. Sufficient housing for current and future generations, including more affordable homes; improvements to existing housing.	
2. New developments that are fit for the future, properly supported by infrastructure, and that build communities, not just housing.	
3. Homes that are flexible for people's changing needs.	

Will this investigation hit one of the essential elements of a scrutiny review when analysing potential scrutiny reviews? If so, which (please tick)	
Public Interest: The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen by overview and scrutiny.	
Impact (Value): Priority should be given to issues that make the biggest difference to the social, economic and environmental wellbeing of the area, and which have the potential to make recommendations which could lead to real improvements. The outcome must also be proportionate to the cost of carrying out the review in terms of staff and councillor time.	
Relevance: Overview and scrutiny must be satisfied that an issue identified for review is relevant and does not duplicate existing work being undertaken elsewhere by various Working Groups, Cabinet, partners etc.	
Partnership working or external scrutiny: The focus of scrutiny is moving towards joint action and community leadership, so anything which offers this opportunity should be given serious consideration.	

Would you like to be involved in the investigation / review?	
Yes	No
Date of request:	Signed

Please return this form to the:

Scrutiny Officer, Forest Heath District Council, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Suffolk, IP28 7EY

Email: Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk

Updated: July 2013

Updated: June 2014 (Revised West Suffolk Strategic Priorities)

Updated: March 2015 (Amended as a Joint Form)

Overview and Scrutiny of Committee



Title of Report:	Work Programme Update	
Report No:	OAS/SE/17/011	
Report to and date:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	15 March 2017
Chairman of the Committee:	Diane Hind Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Tel: 07890 198957 Email: diane.hind@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) Tel: 01638 719729 Email: christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	To update the Committee on the current status of its rolling work programme of annual items for scrutiny during 2017 (Appendix 1);	
Recommendation:	Overview and Scrutiny Committee: That, Members <u>note</u> the current status of the work programme and the annual items expected during 2017-2018.	
Key Decision: (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <u>do not</u> apply.)	Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition? Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Documents attached:	Appendix 1 – Current Work Programme	

1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations

1.1 Rolling Work Programme

- 1.1.1 The Committee has a rolling work programme, whereby suggestions for scrutiny reviews are brought to each meeting, and if accepted, are timetabled to report to a future meeting.
- 1.1.2 The work programme also leaves space for Call-ins and Councillor Calls for Action. The current position of the work programme for 2017-2018 is attached at **Appendix 1** for information.
- 1.1.3 Members are asked to note the current status of its work programme for 2017-2018.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Rolling Work Programme (St Edmundsbury Borough Council)

The Committee has a rolling work programme, whereby suggestions for scrutiny reviews are brought to each meeting, and if accepted, are timetabled to report to a future meeting.

The work programme also leaves space for Call-ins and Councillor Calls for Action.

Description	Lead Member	Details
19 April 2017		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership	Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities	To review the work of the partnership on an annual basis.
West Suffolk Information Strategy	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise a West Suffolk Information Strategy, which has been jointly produced with Forest Heath District Council. – Deferred to November 2017
West Suffolk Housing Strategy	Portfolio Holder for Housing	To receive a progress report against action points.
Review and Revision of the Constitution	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	The Constitution requires the Committee to receive on a quarterly basis a report on minor amendments made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.
Directed Surveillance (Quarter 4)	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Description	Lead Member	Details
7 June 2017		
Draft West Suffolk Annual Report	Leader of the Council	To provide an input to this important document.
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Leader of the Council	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update and Re-appointments to Suffolk County Health Scrutiny	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales. (To re-appoint the Suffolk County Council Health Scrutiny Committee for 2017-2018.
19 July 2017		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Review and Revision of the Constitution	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	The Constitution requires the Committee to receive on a quarterly basis a report on minor amendments made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.
Directed Surveillance (Quarter 1)	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Description	Lead Member	Details
13 September 2017		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Establishing a Mechanism for Facilitating Growth and Investment by West Suffolk Councils	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To consider the development of an overarching strategy for the councils' assets and investments.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
8 November 2017		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
West Suffolk Information Strategy	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise a West Suffolk Information Strategy, which has been jointly produced with Forest Heath District Council.
Review and Revision of the Constitution	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	The Constitution requires the Committee to receive on a quarterly basis a report on minor amendments made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.
Directed Surveillance (Quarter 2)	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Description	Lead Member	Details
10 January 2018		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Car Parking	Portfolio Holder for Operations	To receive an annual report on car parking in the Borough.
Review and Revision of the Constitution	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	The Constitution requires the Committee to receive on a quarterly basis a report on minor amendments made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.
Directed Surveillance (Quarter 3)	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
7 March 2018		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Description	Lead Member	Details
18 April 2018		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	To be confirmed	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to provide an update on their portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
Review and Revision of the Constitution	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	The Constitution requires the Committee to receive on a quarterly basis a report on minor amendments made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.
Directed Surveillance (Quarter 4)	Portfolio Holder for Resources & Performance	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Leader of the Council	To peruse the latest Decision Plan for items on which it would like further information or feels might benefit from the Committee's involvement.
Work Programme Update	Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Futures items identified to be programmed:

1. Future Developments for Regional Transport in West Suffolk (A1307) – Progress Report.

This page is intentionally left blank