

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Agenda</b>															
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Thursday 10 November 2016</b>															
<b>Time:</b>	<b>6.00 pm</b>															
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Council Chamber District Offices</b> College Heath Road Mildenhall															
<b>Full Members:</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chairman</b> Simon Cole</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Vice Chairman</b> Ruth Bowman</p> <p><u>Conservative Members (7)</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Chris Barker</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Brian Harvey</td> <td style="width: 33%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Bloodworth</td> <td>Christine Mason</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ruth Bowman</td> <td>Nigel Roman</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rona Burt</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>West Suffolk Independent Members (2)</u></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Simon Cole</td> <td style="width: 33%;">David Palmer</td> <td style="width: 33%;"></td> </tr> </table> <p><u>UKIP Member (1)</u> Reg Silvester</p>	Chris Barker	Brian Harvey		John Bloodworth	Christine Mason		Ruth Bowman	Nigel Roman		Rona Burt			Simon Cole	David Palmer	
Chris Barker	Brian Harvey															
John Bloodworth	Christine Mason															
Ruth Bowman	Nigel Roman															
Rona Burt																
Simon Cole	David Palmer															
<b>Substitutes:</b>	Named substitutes are not appointed															
<b>Interests – Declaration and Restriction on Participation:</b>	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.															
<b>Quorum:</b>	Three Members															
<b>Committee administrator:</b>	<b>Christine Brain</b> Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719729 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk">christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>															

# Public Information



Forest Heath

District Council

<b>Venue:</b>	<b>District Offices</b> College Heath Road Mildenhall Suffolk, IP28 7EY	Tel: 01638 719000 Email: <a href="mailto:democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk">democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a> Web: <a href="http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk">www.westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>
<b>Access to agenda and reports before the meeting:</b>	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.	
<b>Attendance at meetings:</b>	The District 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.	
<b>Public speaking:</b>	<p>Members of the public who live or work in the District 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.</p> <p>A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start.</p> <p>There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.</p>	
<b>Disabled access:</b>	The public gallery is on the first floor and is accessible via stairs. There is not a lift but disabled seating is available at the back of the Council Chamber on the ground floor. Please see the Committee Administrator who will be able to help you.	
<b>Induction loop:</b>	An Induction loop operates to enhance sound for anyone wearing a hearing aid or using a transmitter.	
<b>Recording of meetings:</b>	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	

# **Agenda**

## **Procedural Matters**

### **Part 1 – Public**

- 1. Substitutes**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Minutes** **1 - 18**

To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 15 September 2016, 4 October 2016 and 20 October 2016 (copies attached).
- 4. Public Participation**

Members of the public who live or work in the District are invited to put question / statements 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 the meeting is scheduled to start.

There is an overall limit of 15 minutes of public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.
- 5. Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Operations** **19 - 22**

Report No: **OAS/FH/16/029**

The Cabinet Member for Operations has been invited to the meeting to provide an annual account on his portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.
- 6. Barley Homes - Five Year Business Plan** **23 - 32**

Report No: **OAS/FH/16/030**
- 7. Car Parking Update** **33 - 40**

Report No: **OAS/FH/16/031**
- 8. Review and Revision of the Constitution (Quarterly Report)** **41 - 46**

Report No: **OAS/FH/16/032**

**9. Directed Surveillance Authorised Applications (Quarter 2)**

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

*The Monitoring Officer advised that in Quarter 2, no such surveillance has been authorised.*

**10. Work Programme Update**

**47 - 50**

Report No: **OAS/FH/16/033**

**11. 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 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**

**12. Exempt Appendix A - Barley Homes Group Business Plan (Para 3)**

**51 - 124**

**Exempt Appendix A to Report No: OAS/FH/16/030**

(This exempt Appendix A is to be considered in private under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Thursday 15 September 2016** at **6.00 pm** at the **Council Chamber, District Offices, College Heath Road, Mildenhall IP28 7EY**

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** Ruth Bowman

John Bloodworth  
Christine Mason  
Reg Silvester

Nigel Roman  
David Palmer

**By Invitation:**

Lance Stanbury, Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth

98. **Substitutes**

There were no substitutes at the meeting.

99. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Chris Barker, Rona Burt, Simon Cole and Brian Harvey.

100. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2016, were accepted by the Committee as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

101. **Public Participation**

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

102. **Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth**

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 Planning and Growth, who had been invited to the meeting.

The Committee was reminded that on 10 September 2015, the Committee received a presentation from the then Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth (Councillor James Waters), setting out responsibilities covered under the planning and growth portfolio.

At this meeting, the newly appointed portfolio holder for Planning and Growth from May 2016, Councillor Lance Stanbury, had been invited to the meeting to provide a follow-up presentation on his portfolio and the work of his predecessor. Report No: OAS/SE/16/021 set out the focus for the follow-up presentation, which was to:

- Outline the main challenges faced since May 2016;
- Outline some key successes and any failures since May 2016 and any lessons learned:
- Set out the vision for the Planning and Growth Portfolio through to 2019 and were you on target to meet that vision.

Councillor Lance Stanbury opened his presentation by thanking the Committee for the invitation. The presentation included information on the areas covered under the portfolio; being Development Management; Planning Policy; Economic Development and Growth; Environmental Health; technical support and local land charges. Each of the areas included examples of success and initiatives, for example:

- Successful transfer of the planning helpdesk to Customer Services;
- Successful implementation of the pre-application charging;
- A11 Corridor Study;
- USAFE regeneration possibilities study;
- Single Issue Review and Site Allocation Local Plans;
- Solar Power generation programme initiative;
- Strengthening licensing enforcement capabilities.

The vision and priority to 2019 was:

- Involving members fully in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Planning Process, and training had already started with members.
- Economic Development by creating a department to support and drive commerce.
- Local plan – implementing the plan in full. The local plan should be seen as an active document as a positive means to get things done.

Members discussed the presentation in detail and asked questions of the Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth and officers, to which comprehensive responses were provided.

In particular discussions were held on initiatives in supporting market towns and the creation of masterplans; the A11 technology study to attract the IT sector along the A11 corridor; the Community Infrastructure Levy; and the

provision of suitable business properties to attract higher salaried jobs to Brandon and the surrounding area.

The Cabinet Member wished to thank officers for all the work they were doing and for the Committee's scrutiny of his portfolio.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for the follow-up presentation on his portfolio.

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

103. **Approach to Delivering a Sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020 and Consideration of the Four-Year Settlement Offer from Central Government**

The Head of Resources and Performance presented Report No: OAS/FH/16/022, which sought to gain the Committee's support for the Council's

- Approach in delivering a sustainable medium term financial strategy 2017-2020; and
- Direction on whether it wished to accept Government's offer of a four-year finance settlement.

The Committee was reminded that the current West Suffolk Medium Term Financial Strategy was approved by Council on 15 September 2015, and the six themes continued to be at the forefront of the council's financial strategies for delivering a sustainable medium term budget. The approach(es) taken to date in delivering a year-on-year savings programme, had in the main, been very successful in delivering balanced budgets that had held up to member scrutiny and challenge and able to absorb changes as a result of external circumstances.

The report also included information on a shift in emphasis for income generation (behaving more commercially and considering new funding models); the current medium term budget gaps and an analysis of the main factors creating those budget gaps; a new approach in delivering a sustainable medium term financial strategy 2017-2020 (Appendix C); central government's four-year settlement offer (Appendix A); and the four-year settlement offer process (accept or reject the Government's offer).

The Committee sought clarification on the meaning of "*income inflation assumptions are less than cost inflation assumptions*", to which the Head of Resources and Performance duly responded.

The Committee scrutinised the report in detail and asked a number of questions, to which officers duly responded. In particular discussions were held on the Government's four-year settlement offer and questioned on what grounds would some local authorities reject the four-year settlement offer.

With the vote being unanimous, it was,

### **RECOMMENDED**

That subject to the approval of full Council, the Cabinet:

- 1) Support the approach to delivering a sustainable medium term financial strategy 2016-2020 as set out in Report No: OAS/FH/16/022;
- 2) Accept Government's offer of a four-year Finance Settlement, and authorises the Head of Resources and Performance (Chief Finance Officer) to advise Government of Council's decision; and
- 3) The Council's existing Medium Term Financial Strategy document and this approach paper be recognised as the Council's Efficiency Plan, for the purposes of accepting any four-year Finance Settlement under (2) above.

#### **104. Local Air Quality Strategy Progress Report (2015-2016)**

The Committee received Report No: OAS/FH/16/023, which reported on work that had been undertaken during 2015-2016 to meet the Local Air Quality Regulations across the District and recommend changes to the approach and specific actions.

Road transport was a major source of air pollution both nationally and locally. The Councils in West Suffolk worked with other organisations to maintain and monitor the quality of air in the locality. Suffolk County Council and the Highways Agency were key partners and worked with council officers to secure good air quality.

For the majority of the District, air quality remained good. However, work had concluded that some areas of the major towns warranted further monitoring to confirm that this continued to be the case in respect of the main pollutant of concern, Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>).

During the year, in addition to the routine work, officers undertook a more strategic review of the approach to air quality across West Suffolk. The timing and scope of the review reflected several factors and needs:

- Changes to statutory guidance published by the Department of the Environment (Defra)
- The role of Suffolk County Council Highways Department in respect of air quality management in the light of experience locally and across Suffolk
- Experienced gained with respect to air quality regulation and planning since the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework in March 2012
- The need to revise, consult upon and adopt an Air Quality Strategy in Forest Heath District Council when it lapses in 2012-2017 given that a



shared service approach has been operating for over three years and no equivalent was adopted in St Edmundsbury.

- The need to raise awareness of the issues of Local Air Quality as they affect the District.

The results of the review were set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report with additional detail provided at Appendix 1. Attached at Appendix 2 was the new streamlined report as recommended by Defra.

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

In particular, discussions were held on the air quality in Brandon. Members were disappointed to see that there had not been a substantial decrease in NO<sub>2</sub>. Officers advised members that they were working with Suffolk County Council to look at why NO<sub>2</sub> levels had not decrease as anticipated in Brandon.

The Committee supported the report, and with the vote being unanimous, it was:

### **RECOMMENDED**

That the Licensing and Regulatory Committee undertake external consultation on the proposal to amend the declared area of the Air Quality Management Area in Newmarket, subject to technical approval from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

#### **105. Final Report of the New Housing Development Sites Joint Task and Finish Group**

The Committee received Report No: OAS/FH/16/024, which provided the findings and recommendations of the New Housing Development Sites Joint Task and Finish Group.

The Joint Task and Finish Group (the Group) was formed in March 2013, to look into the problems of adoption sometimes encountered on larger housing developments, and related to both open space and highways matters. Problems had been encountered in the past when houses were occupied before the promised open space or access roads had been completed and adopted.

The Group considered ways in which the Development Management Service and other corporate teams (such as Parks), and Suffolk County Council Highways could work smarter together to avoid these problems in the future with major housing schemes.

It was reported that both Cambridgeshire County Council and Northamptonshire County Council had protocols in place to ensure that suitable planning conditions were imposed with major developments to ensure that phasing of streets and adoptions were controlled through the planning process. In addition, Central Government recommended the use of similar standard conditions where appropriate.

The use of such conditions needed to be agreed with Suffolk County Council (SCC), as Highways Authority. SCC had indicated that they would be amenable in using such conditions, subject to all other Suffolk authorities signing up to their use. The use of such conditions was generally seen as good practice and other colleagues in Suffolk were also informally amenable to their use.

In addition to moving forward with conditions to address matters of concern regarding adoption of roads, there were a number of other ways identified in which officers could work more corporately in ensuring issues regarding adoption of highways and other facilities, such as open space and play facilities were well planned with joined up thinking from the start of the development process. This was felt to be particularly important for major developments and strategic sites across the two authorities. A new pre-application advice regime which was tailored to the type of development proposed had just been launched across West Suffolk. The service included involving key stakeholders/consultees such as the highways authority and the Council's Parks team for major and strategic sites. Best practice recommended that early involvement from consultees, in particular, ensured a smoother process and a better scheme being delivered when a planning application was formally submitted.

The Group had concluded that the introduction of standard conditions regarding adoption would improve the situation currently encountered and the good practice pre-application advice and the development team approach would also provide benefits in addressing the concerns raised by the Group.

The Committee considered the report of the Joint Task and Finish Group and asked questions to which responses were provided.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

### **RECOMMENDED**

That the Head of Planning and Growth progresses with Suffolk County Council and the other Suffolk authorities the introduction of standard conditions regarding highway adoption.

#### **106. Decisions Plan: September 2016 to May 2017**

The Committee received Report No: OAS/FH/16/025, which requested that Members peruse the Cabinet Decisions Plan for the period September 2016 to May 2017 for which it would like further information on or might benefit from the Committee's involvement.

The Committee considered the Decisions Plan, and asked questions to which officers provided responses.

There being no decision required, **noted** the contents of the Decisions Plan.

## 107. **Work Programme Update**

The Committee received Report No: OAS/FH/16/026, which updated Members on the current status of its rolling work programme of items for scrutiny during 2016-2017 (Appendix 1).

The Chairman updated the Committee on the issue of parking enforcement in Newmarket in relation to specific roads. A reworded suggestion form had not been resubmitted at this time, because since the Committee's last meeting, the Councils representative, Councillor Brian Harvey on the Suffolk Police and Crime Panel had raised the Committees concerns with the Panel regarding parking issues in Newmarket. A task force team on enforcement had been established to try and "blitz" areas where parking was an issue in Newmarket. If following this initiative, parking issues in Newmarket had not improved, a reworded suggestion form on parking enforcement in Newmarket could be resubmitted to the Committee in January 2017, for further consideration.

There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the update on the current status of its forward work programme.

The Meeting concluded at 7.43pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

---

# Extraordinary Informal Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

**Notes of Informal Discussions held on Tuesday 4 October 2016 at  
6.00pm in the Conference Chamber West, West Suffolk House,  
Western Way, Bury St Edmunds**

PRESENT: St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC)

Councillors Tony Brown, John Burns, Patrick Chung, Jeremy Farthing, Paula Fox, Susan Glossop, Diane Hind, Paul Hopfensperger, Richard Rout, Angela Rushen, Clive Springett and Patricia Warby.

Forest Heath District Council (FHDC)

Councillor Simon Cole  
(Chairman for the informal discussions)

Councillors Chris Barker, John Bloodworth, Ruth Bowman, Rona Burt, Brian Harvey, Christine Mason and David Palmer.

IN ATTENDANCE: Ian Gallin, Chief Executive of Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Councils

SEBC – Councillor John Griffiths, Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Devolution

SEBC – Councillor Ian Houlder, Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance

FHDC – Councillor James Waters, Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Devolution

Prior to the formal meeting, at 6.00pm informal joint discussions took place on the following item:

(1) What Will Devolution Mean for West Suffolk?

All Members of Forest Heath District Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been invited to attend West Suffolk House, Bury St Edmunds to enable informal joint discussions on the above report to take place between the two authorities.

The Chairman of St Edmundsbury's Overview and Scrutiny Committee welcomed all those present to West Suffolk House, Bury St Edmunds and advised on the format of the proceedings for the informal joint discussions and subsequent separate meetings of each authority, prior to handing over to the Chairman of Forest Heath's Overview and Scrutiny Committee, who would be chairing the informal joint discussions.

Members noted that each Council permitted public participation at their Overview and Scrutiny meetings. Therefore, for the purpose of facilitating these Constitutional requirements, it was proposed that public speaking should be permitted prior to the start of the informal joint discussions to enable any questions/statements to be considered by both Overview and Scrutiny Committees on item 1 above.

On this occasion however, there were no questions/statements from members of the public.

The report was then considered in the order listed on each authorities agenda.

#### 1. **What Will Devolution Mean for West Suffolk?**

Councillor Diane Hind introduced Report No: OAS/SE/16/026 and OAS/FH/16/027, which provided Members with a summary of the key issues identified following a workshop session held on 8 September 2016.

In examining the issue of Devolution, and how Overview and Scrutiny could influence or have an input, a workshop was initiated by Councillor Diane Hind, Chairman of St Edmundsbury's Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Councillor Simon Cole, Chairman of Forest Heath's Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to help inform, focus and drive the agenda for the Informal Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 4 October 2016.

The aim of the workshop was to identify any points of concern members had on Devolution, and covered the following areas:

- Overall principle of Devolution and its ever changing environment;
- Content of the Norfolk/Suffolk Devolution deals;
- Summary of consultation results;
- Double Devolution and Subsidiarity; and
- The role of scrutiny in a devolved structure.

Five areas were identified during the workshop, which it was felt scrutiny would benefit from more information on:

- 1) Running costs of the Combined Authority;
- 2) Statutory bodies and their duties/powers in relation to the role of the Combined Authority and the arrangements proposed for voting;
- 3) The Combined Authority Board and Co-opted persons;
- 4) Governance and exit arrangements;
- 5) Double Devolution and Subsidiarity.

Section 3 of Report No: OAS/SE/16/026 and OAS/FH/16/027 provided additional information on the five areas identified, as set out above.

The Committee was asked to discuss the key issues as set out in Section 3 of the report, and to formulate any findings, as appropriate.

The Committee scrutinised the report and asked a number of questions to which responses were provided.

In response to a number of questions raised, the Chief Executive and the Leader's advised the Committee:

#### Update on Devolution Process

- 1) MORI would be running through the consultation results with Members across Suffolk on 11 October 2016 (11am and 1.30pm). The event was also being videoed for members who could not attend.
- 2) The timetable for Council to consider giving consent to an Order establishing a Mayoral Combined Authority for Norfolk and Suffolk had been delayed by the Government. Council was now being asked to consider the Draft Order on the following dates:
  - SEBC – Monday 21 November 2016, 6.30pm (SEBC Conference Chamber)
  - FHDC – Tuesday 22 November 2016, 6pm (FHDC Council Chamber)
- 3) In the last couple of days the Prime Minister, Theresa May had stated "no mayor, no devolution deal". This had been welcomed by many, as the clarity was needed.
- 4) All constituent councils in the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution Deal would be asked by 24 November 2016 to vote for a Combined Authority. If one of the remaining constituent councils voted against a Combined Authority, then the deal would collapse.
- 5) A Suffolk only devolution deal had not been ruled out. There were a number of potential future options if any of the constituent councils did not vote for the Combined Authority. However, it would be a new deal from scratch and any future options would need careful consideration.

#### Running costs of a Combined Authority

- 1) Within the Norfolk and Suffolk Deal, £25 million a year of new money would be provided for the next 30 years to support economic growth; development of local infrastructures and jobs.
- 2) The Government had proposed gateway reviews to be carried out every five years between the Combined Authority and the Government in relation to the £25 million funding per year.
- 3) All Constituent Councils within a Combined Authority would be equal partners and would have one vote, except where the members had a statutory role.

- 4) A Shadow Combined Authority would be created and would be made up of existing staff to carry out the roles of the three statutory posts. Once the Elected Mayor was in place, they would then decide on staffing.

#### Combined Authority Board and Co-opted persons

Members expressed concerns regarding the Mayor and their ability to vote against a majority decision or proposal by right of veto.

#### Double devolution and subsidiarity

Double devolution and subsidiarity was not about structural change, but wanting to see more engagement and delivery locally; making accountability more local and the need to deliver what was contained with the devolution deal.

The Chairman summed up the informal joint discussions by thanking the Leaders and the Chief Executive for attending the meeting. The session had served its purpose in allowing Overview and Scrutiny members in making the Leaders aware of their concerns, in particular the Mayor and their veto vote.

On the conclusion of the informal joint discussions at 7.34pm, the Chairman then formally opened the Forest Heath District Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee in Conference Chamber West at 7.35pm.



# Extraordinary Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Tuesday 4 October 2016** at **7.35 pm** in **Conference Chamber West, West Suffolk House**, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** Simon Cole

**Vice Chairman** Ruth Bowman

Chris Barker  
John Bloodworth  
Rona Burt

Brian Harvey  
Christine Mason  
David Palmer

108. **Substitutes**

There were no substitutes declared.

109. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Reg Silvester and Nigel Roman.

110. **Public Participation**

Public participation had been included within the previous informal joint discussions and there had been no questions/statements from members of the public.

111. **What will Devolution Mean for West Suffolk?**

Further to the joint informal discussions held prior to the meeting with St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Committee formally considered Report No: OAS/FH/16/027.

Members had scrutinised the report in detail and had asked questions to which responses were provided.

Councillor Ruth Bowman moved the recommendation, this was duly seconded by Councillor Rona Burt and with the vote being unanimous, it was

**RECOMMENDED:** That

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee wished to express its concerns to Cabinet regarding the veto vote of the Mayor.

The Meeting concluded at 7.36 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

# Extraordinary Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** held on **Thursday 20 October 2016** at **6.00 pm** at the **Council Chamber, District Offices**, College Heath Road, Mildenhall IP28 7EY

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** Simon Cole  
**Vice Chairman** Ruth Bowman

Chris Barker  
John Bloodworth  
Brian Harvey

David Palmer  
Nigel Roman

**Also in Attendance:**

David Bowman, Cabinet Member for Operations  
Lance Stanbury, Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth

Dean Robbie, Service Delivery Manager, Stephenson's of Essex

**112. Substitutes**

There were no substitutes declared.

**113. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rona Burt, Christine Mason and Reg Silvester.

**114. Public Participation**

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

**115. Transport Links for Rural Villages in Forest Heath**

The Committee received Report No: OAS/FH/16/028, which was the second in a series of reports/meetings looking at the disjointed and unpredictable way of public transport connections in Forest Heath, particularly in the case of Red Lodge.

For this meeting, the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, in consultation with Councillor Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth had selected four public transport operators to invite to the meeting to discuss transport issues affecting Red Lodge (Abellio Greater Anglia; Coach Services Limited; Mulleys Motorways Limited and Stephenson's of Essex).

Each of the four providers had been asked in advance of the meeting to respond to a series of questions. Responses were received from three of the transport providers and were attached at Appendix 1 to Report No: OAS/FH/16/028 (Abellio Greater Anglia; Coach Services Limited and Stephenson's of Essex). Attached at Appendix 1A to the report was a late response to the questions submitted by Mulleys Motorways Limited on 17 October 2016.

The aim of the meeting on 20 October 2016 was to hear from the transport providers regarding the rural transport services they provide; their integration in Red Lodge, and for the Committee to discuss its concerns.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Dean Robbie, Service Delivery Manager from Stephenson's of Essex.

Dean briefly informed the Committee on the history of Stephenson's of Essex; his role in the company as Service Delivery Manager and previous transport roles held. He explained that the aim of Stephenson's of Essex was to integrate services where possible. However, this was not included as an element in the tendering process when bidding for new routes. The company tried to liaise with train companies, but the trains did not often co-ordinate with schools. 95% of the time the company did get it right, and tried to improve where it was not so good such as trying to improve communications and the selling of services, which was a joint venture between the buses and local authority.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth discussed the wider issue of economic development, in particular Red Lodge, which was growing. He informed the Committee that public transport from Red Lodge to Cambridge did not link up, and questioned how this could be achieved.

In response, Dean explained that the company was trying to achieve growth on the 16-16A bus route, which ran an hourly service from Newmarket via Red Lodge to Bury St Edmunds. The company wanted to sell its service with reliable and decent buses to grow the business further into Suffolk.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth addressed Dean as to whether there could be an opportunity to see if the 16/16A bus route could be used as a pilot with Forest Heath District Council; Suffolk County Council and officers to work with Stephenson's of Essex to really try and get the route going.

In response Dean stated that the company aimed to work with everybody, and that the company as a business wanted to grow its brand from Stephenson's of Essex into Stephenson's of Suffolk.

The Committee questioned whether the Council had sight of proposed new transport routes in Forest Heath, and if not, whether it could make

recommendations to Suffolk County Council (SCC) to have sight of these in future.

In response the Cabinet Member for Operations informed the Committee that he sat on the Joint Suffolk County Council/West Suffolk Cabinet Member Meeting (Highways and Transport), and did not see why future transport routes could not be included on the agenda.

The Committee also discussed issues around multi-ticketing; timetabling on mobile phone apps; bus passes and reimbursement; customer experience; monitoring bus route reliability; SCC routes and tendering; bus stations and bus stops, to which Dean provided comprehensive responses.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Committee thanked Dean Robbie for attending the meeting, which everyone felt had been extremely useful. Mr Robbie then left the meeting at 6.55pm

The Committee expressed some disappointment in that only one of the transport providers had attended the meeting, but noted that Abellio Greater Anglia (ABA) had sent apologies, and indicated that AGA would be happy to speak or meet with officers or councillors after the meeting, giving the Committee the opportunity to ask any further questions or to discuss the outcome of the meeting. The Chairman informed the Committee that this was indicative of the industry as a whole and showed the kind of institutionalised attitude that the Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth would be up against.

The Committee then discussed other responses received from Abellio Greater Anglia; Coach Services Limited and Mulleys Motorways Limited (Appendix 1 and 1A).

Members also discussed bus contracts and questioned how long contracts were awarded for and whether there were any key performance indicators on the contracts and penalties incurred; needing a better understanding of the tendering process; whether S106 monies were being spent wisely; and the prospect of devolution which would hopefully help in improving infrastructure and transport in the future.

The Committee suggested that the next step would be for the Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth to meet transport providers individually, particularly Dean Robbie from Stephenson's of Essex, to discuss further the operation of the 16/16A bus route to see what could be done, working with Suffolk CC as well, to improve the integration and advertising of this service.

It was further suggested that the Cabinet Member for Operations liaises with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth regarding future meetings of the Joint Suffolk County Council/West Suffolk Cabinet Member Meeting (Highways and Transport).

Councillor Nigel Roman moved the recommendations, this was duly seconded by Councillor Brian Harvey and with the vote being unanimous, it was

**RECOMMENDED:** that

- 1) The Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth be asked to further progress discussions with transport operators, in particular Stephenson's of Essex, to see how services could be improved in terms of delivery and promotion.
- 2) The Cabinet Member for Operations liaises with the Cabinet Member for Planning in Growth regarding future meetings of the Joint Suffolk County Council/West Suffolk Cabinet Member meeting (Highways and Transport).

The Meeting concluded at 7.25pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Operations</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>OAS/FH/16/029</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	10 November 2016
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	David Bowman Portfolio Holder for Operations <b>Tel:</b> 07711 593737 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:david.bowman@forest-heath.gov.uk">david.bowman@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719729 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk">Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	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.  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.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Members of the Committee are asked to question the Cabinet Member for Operations on his portfolio responsibilities.</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>  <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> 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"/>	

<b>Consultation:</b>	• N/A		
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	• N/A		
<b>Implications:</b>			
Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	•
<b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b>		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
<b>Risk area</b>	<b>Inherent level of risk</b> (before controls)	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
None			
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	All		
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	None		
<b>Documents attached:</b>	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 12 November 2015, the Committee received a presentation from the Cabinet Member for Operations, Councillor David Bowman, summarising the following responsibilities covered under his portfolio for operations:

- Car parking;
- CCTV;
- Cemeteries;
- Fleet management;
- Grounds maintenance;
- Land drainage;
- Markets (delivery);
- Operations;
- Property services and estate management;
- Public conveniences;
- Refuse/recycling
- Street scene; and
- Tourism (operations)

### **1.2 Progress Update**

1.2.1 At this meeting, the Cabinet Member for Operations has been invited back to provide a follow-up presentation 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 Operations 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 Operations, following his presentation.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Barley Homes – Five Year Business Plan</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>OAS/FH/16/030</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	10 November 2016
	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Sara Mildmay-White Lead Portfolio Holder for Housing <b>Tel:</b> 01359 270580 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk">sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719245 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:rachael.mann@westsuffolk.gov.uk">rachael.mann@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	<p>In November 2015 the Council approved the establishment of a Housing Development Company, limited by shares for the purpose of developing housing for sale, private and affordable rent.</p> <p>In principle approval was given for the Council to provide the Company with funding through state aid compliant loans in line with the Council's Loans Policy. This in principle funding was subject to the approval of a Business Plan by the Shareholders (Forest Heath District Council's full Council, St Edmundsbury Borough Council's full Council and Suffolk County Council's Cabinet).</p> <p>In December 2016, full Council will be asked to consider Barley Homes initial five year Business Plan and approve the funding mechanism required to deliver the plan. Prior to consideration at Cabinet and Full Council, this committee is asked to scrutinise the content of the Business Plan.</p>	

<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>It is <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that, the Committee:</p> <p>(1) <b>Considers the initial Barley Homes five year Business Plan; and</b></p> <p>(2) <b>Recommends to Cabinet, subject to full Council:</b></p> <p>(a) <b>Any amendments and approval of the five year Business Plan attached at Exempt Appendix A;</b></p> <p>(b) <b>Approval of a £3m revolving investment facility, to be added to the Council’s capital programme, financed from the reallocation of the ‘Housing Company’ pending capital budget of £3m.</b></p> <p>(c) <b>Delegation to the S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Resources and Performance and Housing, to issue equity and loan funding from the revolving investment facility (set out in 2b above), subject to state aid requirements;</b></p> <p>(d) <b>The S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer, in consultation with Portfolio Holder Resources and Performance, be authorised to negotiate and agree the terms of such loans with Barley Homes and the funding and necessary legal agreements, taking into consideration the Council’s loans policy and state aid requirements;</b></p> <p>(e) <b>Note that approval of this Business Plan will constitute consent for Barley Homes to issue shares and enter into debt financing, in line with the Business Plan.</b></p>	
<b>Consultation:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barley Homes Shareholder Advisory Group</li> <li>• Suffolk County Council</li> <li>• Internal – finance, legal and Human Resources</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None – a Business Plan is required in order for funding to be approved.</li> </ul>	
<b>Implications:</b>		
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to section four of this report</li> </ul>

<p>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None directly but Barley Homes will be appointing a Development Manager to take the developments forward, all the costs have already been included the development appraisals.</li> </ul>	
<p>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None arising from his report</li> </ul>	
<p>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to section six of this report</li> </ul>	
<p>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</p>		<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None arising from this report. An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was undertaken prior to consideration of the establishment of the company. Paper OAS/SE/15/012 refers</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b></p>		<p><i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i></p>	
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
Business Plan insufficiently robust / not tested	Medium	<p>Utilising the expertise of specialist financial and property consultants</p> <p>Sensitivity analysis carried out to test impact of negative movement on key assumptions (see section 2.5 of Business Plan)</p> <p>Scrutiny of external modelling by Finance staff and tax advisors.</p> <p>Detailed site appraisals and costings to be undertaken on obtaining planning permission(s) on the sites</p>	Low
Insufficient regular monitoring of performance of Barley Homes against Business Plan by shareholder councils	Medium	Regular monitoring through Shareholder Advisory Group - made up of Councillors from shareholding councils, supported by S151 and Monitoring officers	Low

<p>Insufficient expertise to ensure achievement of best value in property construction</p>	<p>Medium/High</p>	<p>Costs of Development  Manager to oversee the development process included within the business plan modelling  Provision for future appointment of independent Company directors with a background in housing development  Option to use Homes and Communities Agency's framework agreements for technical consultants and construction</p>	<p>Low/Medium</p>
<p>Adverse movements in the housing market, such as property sales and/or rental price deflation, higher than anticipated building cost inflation, leaving the Company committed to unviable schemes</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Consideration of viability on a site-by-site basis so that if a scheme is not modelled to be viable, commencement is delayed or cancelled  With assistance of the Development Manager, keep up-to-date with building costs and sales market</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Uncertainty over the impact upon the construction and housing market post EU referendum</p>	<p>Medium/high</p>	<p>Sensitivity analysis included in Business Plan (see exempt Appendix A section 2.5)</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>Failure of Barley Homes and loss of shareholder capital and loans</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Business Plan has tested the viability of sites and profitability of Barley Homes.  Loans to be secured against assets of Barley Homes such as land and retained properties.  Shareholder capital level to be regularly reviewed to minimise overall shareholders exposure</p>	<p>Low</p>

Barley Homes is challenged over its financial make up in the market	Medium	Funding proposals are based on advice obtained around state aid and HMRC rules compliance.  Barley Homes is structured as a commercial company.	Low
Council receives less than market value for the land	Medium	Site viabilities have been tested within the development of the Business Plan (still subject to planning and site investigations).  Council to ensure land is sold at market value to Barley Homes to comply with its S123 best value obligations.	Low
Council relies on returns from Barley Homes which are not sustainable in the future	Medium	Continue to review (rolling) five year business plans for Barley Homes and seek stable returns in the longer term. Reflect any reduced returns in the medium term financial projections as part of reviewing the five year business plan.	Low
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	All Ward/s		
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	<a href="#">OAS/FH/15/012</a> <a href="#">CAB/FH/15/048</a> <a href="#">COU/FH/15/036</a> <a href="#">COU/FH/16/004</a>		
<b>Documents attached:</b>	<b>EXEMPT – Appendix A</b> - Barley Homes Five Year business plan and appendices		

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)**

### **1.1 Background**

- 1.1.1 Following approval by both Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury in November 2015 (report COU/FH/15/036 refers) Barley Homes (Group) Limited was incorporated in March 2016 as a company limited by shares, jointly owned by Forest Heath District Council (25%), St Edmundsbury Borough Council (25%) and Suffolk County Council (50%). The primary function of Barley Homes is to generate capital and revenue income for the councils through the development of new housing for sale and rent, on land owned by one of the councils initially in west Suffolk. The establishment of the housing company is one of the many ways that the council is using to generate income to become self-sufficient as central government grants are reduced and eventually removed.
- 1.1.2 Financial returns to the councils will be generated through a combination of, the councils' role as a:
1. **Landowner through land sale receipt** – with Barley Homes paying market value for the land it buys with planning permission from the landholding council
  2. **Funder through interest receipts** – on loans provided to Barley Homes at commercial rates
  3. **Shareholder through dividends** – from profits generated by Barley Homes
  4. **Service provider through contracts** – from services contracted by Barley Homes from the council
- 1.1.3 All funding provided to Barley Homes by the councils will be provided in a form to satisfy both HMRC tax and state aid regulations. Further information is contained in sections six and seven of the Business Plan (**Exempt Appendix A**).
- 1.1.4 Shareholder oversight of Barley Homes activities is undertaken via the Shareholder Advisory Group, which consists of eight elected members drawn from the three Councils, supported by the Section 151 and Monitoring officers. The group meets regularly with the directors of the company to scrutinise the performance of the company and to represent the interests of the shareholders.

### **2. Five year business plan –key issues**

- 2.1 Since its establishment in March 2016, Barley Homes has focussed on the development of its first Business Plan. The Business Plan is based on the delivery of initial sites over the first five years of activity.
- 2.2 Following an open quotation process, Savills were commissioned by Barley Homes to assist in the development of the initial five-year Business Plan, a copy of which is attached to this paper (**Exempt Appendix A**). The Business



Plan contains details of the initial developments, the amount and type of funding required to complete the developments and the expected returns generated for the councils. Section 2 of the Business Plan contains an executive summary of all the key financial information, with the rest of the plan going into greater detail.

- 2.3 To aid presentation and an understanding of the overall Barley Homes operation and to provide transparency on the investment and returns from the different activities, the financial analysis and modelling has been separated into the two distinct business activities: (i) development; and (ii) investment.
- 2.4 Since the Business Plan was produced a further review of the advice given by Deloitte (as part of the initial Housing Company business case), has confirmed that it would be most tax efficient to separate the various activities of Barley Homes into separate entities to reflect the nature of the activity i.e. development and investment. This would likely require Barley Homes (Group) Ltd to act as the holding company. The exact nature of the company structure will be discussed with the Shareholder Advisory Group in due course. Regardless of the company structure, the value, type and timing of this funding is detailed in the Business Plan (**Exempt Appendix A, section 2.2**) with an overview provided in section four below.

### **3. Initial sites**

- 3.1 In preparation of the Business Plan, a total of 43 development sites (under the ownership of the three councils) were identified and rated as to their suitability and deliverability within the timeframe. Following this assessment four "initial sites" have been prioritised for delivery in the first five years. In addition to the initial sites, an outline programme of activity for a number of "secondary sites" has also been drawn up, with work also starting on identifying a portfolio of longer-term pipeline sites. Information relating to the sites is contained in the Business Plan (**Exempt Appendix A**).
- 3.2 In order to maximise the return from the sale of the land to Barley Homes it is assumed that the landholding authority secures outline planning permission for residential development on the land prior to its sale.
- 3.3 As the development of housing through Barley Homes is a new venture for the shareholding councils and in order to limit the potential exposure to risk, it was agreed by the Shareholder Advisory Group to concentrate on those sites that were the most straightforward to develop and readily available. The advice from Savills is that the proposed development programme is a realistic and deliverable one for a new company the size of Barley Homes to be able to deliver over the life of the five-year business plan. As knowledge and expertise is gained within the company from developing the initial sites, there would be scope to increase the scale and ambition of development.
- 3.4 The initial five-year business plan will be revised on a regular basis as new sites are identified and brought forward. In accordance with the Shareholder Agreement an annual delivery plan will be presented to the Shareholder Advisory Group and presented to the councils for approval.

#### **4. Investment opportunity and financial returns**

- 4.1 The investment required to deliver the four initial sites and the expected returns to be achieved are summarised on pages 7-11 of the Business Plan (**Exempt Appendix A**). It is important to note that all of the figures contained in the business plan are based on the current modelling and without detailed site investigations so there may be variations in both the costs and receipts in the final scheme delivery. A sensitivity and risk analysis has been undertaken and is included within the Business Plan (sections 2.5 and 3.7).
- 4.2 The total funding required for the five year plan, with a peak funding requirement of £11.1m in 2019/20, equates to an investment (through a combination of equity and debt) of £2.782m, rounded to £3m to allow some flexibility, for both Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury reflecting the individual councils' 25% shareholdings. It should also be noted that the current approved Capital Programme for Forest Heath includes an allocation of £3m towards investment in Barley Homes (report COU/FH/16/004 refers).
- 4.3 As detailed in the Business Plan all of the development loan funding will be repaid by Barley Homes. However, there will be a long term funding requirement for investment of £1.23 million from Forest Heath (£4.9m in total from the three councils) in order to be able to purchase the rental portfolio if this is felt to be financially beneficial (see paragraph 4.6 below).
- 4.4 The revenue returns expected for the shareholders, from investment in the short term development period and long term property investment across the five year business plan total £3.8m, to the period 2021/22. This equates to £954,000 each for both Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury. The long term property investment return will of course continue beyond the 5 year period contained within the report.
- 4.5 In addition to the revenue returns, the councils will receive full market value payments for land sales in their ownership and will benefit from the longer-term growth in the value of the investment properties retained.
- 4.6 An option also exists for the councils not to build the private rented units, but to replace them with open market properties nor to retain the affordable rented units within the investment company, but to sell them to a suitable registered provider. This option would not require the on-going £4.9m capital investment across all the shareholders, but would result in the loss of the on-going revenue income. Further analysis will need to be undertaken as to the viability of both options and will be presented to Shareholder Advisory Group for their consideration.
- 4.7 In order to comply with state aid and HMRC tax rules the investment modelling for the shareholders, contained in the Business Plan (**Exempt Appendix A**), works on an equity investment (as unsecured shareholder capital) of around 35% and a loan investment (attracting a commercial interest rate) of 65%. It is this funding that will be used by the investment company to purchase the rental properties for investment, should it wish to do so.
- 4.8 This investment opportunity is in line with the internal rate of return within the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy of 10% and therefore meets the

desired return when appraised on the basis of being funded by prudential borrowing. Actual borrowing will only take place when the Council's treasury management activities identify such a need, for example, the Council's cash flow management activities project that an external cash injection is required to maintain the appropriate level of cash balances for the Council to operate and fulfil its budget and service delivery requirements.

- 4.9 The Council currently manages funds in excess of this and therefore external borrowing is not expected during the life of this investment for this investment in isolation. The proposal is that the funding for this investment is financed (albeit it will be a revolving fund so is financing on a cash flow basis) from a pending capital programme allocation and a strategic revenue reserve therefore it is proposed that the full revenue returns of this investment opportunity is realised to support the general fund budget.

## **5. Monitoring of progress and future development decisions**

- 5.1 In order for Barley Homes to operate flexibly in the commercial market, it is proposed that a revolving investment fund of £3m (covers equity share capital and loan facility) is agreed by full Council with the necessary delegations to the statutory S151 and Monitoring Officer to negotiate, sign and implement the loan agreements between Barley Homes and the Council to deliver the business plan.
- 5.2 Each development scheme will require detailed project and financial management and the Shareholder Advisory Group will be responsible for scrutinising the Company's development appraisals. In addition, each year the Councils will receive an Annual Report detailing progress made and future development plans.
- 5.3 During the delivery of the five year business plan it is recognised the commercial opportunities may arise which would benefit the councils. In order to maximise these opportunities, Barley Homes will be able to access the capped loan fund. However, any investment decision would only be made in line with the financial delegation, subject to the scrutiny of the Shareholder Advisory Group and reported as part of the annual report to the councils. Any further sums of money required over and above the capped load would be requested from full Council.

## **6. Delivery of the Business Plan**

- 6.1 Barley Homes requires support to deliver the four initial sites, and develop potential future sites. This support is likely to be in the form of a Development Manager whose role would be to prepare a detailed delivery plan and provide leadership, management and procurement of a professional team to deliver the sites. An allowance to meet these costs has been included within the Business Plan (see section 3.3.3)

## **7 Legal implications**

- 7.1 Expert legal opinion was sought by Trowers and Hamblins during the development of the business case to establish the company and they have supported the preparation of the company's Memorandum and Articles of Association and Shareholder Agreement.
- 7.2 In terms of state aid, the councils must show that they are **not** providing state aid and this has been reflected in the loan terms and market interest rate used. State aid, in whatever form, which could distort competition and affect trade by favouring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods, is incompatible with the common market. Having sought independent advice on this, the Council is satisfied that the equity/loan split does not constitute state aid.
- 7.3 It is for Barley Homes to ensure that it complies with all the necessary tax rules, particularly relating to thin capitalisation (a company is said to be thinly capitalised when the level of its debt is much greater than its equity i.e. its gearing, or leverage, is very high). If HMRC believe that the rules around thin capitalisation, and other matters are not met then the amount of interest the company can offset against its profits will be restricted. In turn this means the company paying higher corporation tax and less profit being available as distribution to the shareholders. The company will continue to seek tax advice throughout its operations and report to the Shareholder Advisory Group as appropriate.

## **8. Next steps**

- 8.1 Following discussion at this Committee, the Business Plan will be considered by Cabinet and full Council in December (with the other councils also seeking the appropriate approval in December). Delivery of the Plan will then begin with construction and completion dates as outlined in the Business Plan (**Exempt Appendix A**). During this period the Shareholder Advisory Group will continue to monitor progress and performance as appropriate.

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Car Parking Update</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>OAS/FH/16/031</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	10 November 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Cllr David Bowman Portfolio Holder for Operations <b>Tel:</b> 07711 593737 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:david.bowman@forest-heath.gov.uk">david.bowman@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Darren Dixon Car Parking Services Manager <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757413 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:darren.dixon@westsuffolk.gov.uk">darren.dixon@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To update Members on the implementation of the Car Parking Review and future priorities	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee:</b>  <b>1) Members are asked to <u>note</u> the report; and</b>  <b>2) Recommend that the Head of Operations, under his delegated authority, and in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Operations, incorporates the Snooker Hall Pocket Car Park spaces into All Saints Car Park for use by pay and display customers.</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>  <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> 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"/>	

<b>Consultation:</b>	Significant consultation was undertaken during the 2015 review. This report sets out the results of the recommendations agreed by stakeholders.		
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Implications:</b>			
Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b>		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
<b>Risk area</b>	<b>Inherent level of risk</b> (before controls)	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)
Car parking tariffs are set incorrectly resulting in sub-optimal performance	Medium	Regular consultation should be carried out to provide clear rationale for proposed changes	Low
Town centres adversely affected by tariff changes	Low	Feedback from customers/ Stakeholders and benchmarking information	Low
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>		All	
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		<a href="#">CAB/FH/15/063</a> dated 22 December 2015 - Car Parking Review	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## 1.0 Key issues and reasons for recommendation

### 1.1 Review

1.1.1 A review of car parking was undertaken in 2015 and a number of recommendations were made to car parking arrangements in Newmarket and levels of enforcement (see background papers). This report provides an update on the implementation these changes and to car parking across the district.

### 1.2 Usage

1.2.1 The use of car parks varies by location and across different times of the week. Usage is measured by the number of car parking ticket transactions in each car park which is recorded when a ticket is purchased from a Pay and Display machine and therefore, only accurate data is available for Newmarket.

1.2.2 The number of car parking ticket transactions in Newmarket increased from 626,867 in 2014 to 683,231 transactions in 2015 which equates to 9%. Over the period Jan-Sept 2016, car parking ticket transactions are up by 11,954 compared with the previous year.

1.2.3 The introduction of weekly long stay tickets has proved popular with an average of 48 sold each week since April 2016. Given that less daily long stay tickets are now being sold, the growth in ticket transactions suggests that the total number of parking transactions in 2016 will exceed that of 2015.

1.2.4 RingGo, the pay by phone cashless payment system, is demonstrating growth in popularity. A total of 11,532 transactions were made by RingGo between Jan-Sept 2016, which already exceeds the total number of transactions made in 2015 of 9,365.

### 1.3 Occupancy

1.3.1 The car parking operation in the towns of Mildenhall, Lakenheath and Brandon is more self-regulatory in the absence of charging or restrictions on permitted length of stay parking. The Council's team of Car Parking Attendants have audited the car parks by counting of parked cars and report the following:

	Average Occupancy
Mildenhall – Recreation CP	60%
Mildenhall – Carters Yard	75%
Brandon – George St	85%
Brandon – Bury Road	80%
Lakenheath	60%

- 1.3.2 The industry standard for an efficient car park is an occupancy rate of 95%. The recorded use of the Mildenhall, Lakenheath and Brandon car parks suggest they operate well below this rate and can accommodate significant growth in the medium to long term.
- 1.3.3 Monitoring of usage in Newmarket has been conducted over the month of October between 11am and 2pm (peak time use). The results compare favourably with the detailed testing undertaken a year ago and includes the first visitors to the Home of Horse Racing.

Short stay car parking (496 spaces)

Car Park	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
Guineas	74%	84%	58%
Rouse	70%	82%	55%
Market	90%	n/a	60%

Saturday has the highest number of parking events across the week, and the occupancy counts suggest that approximately 40 car parking spaces are available at peak times.

Long- stay car parking (393 spaces)

Car Park	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
Guineas	77%	74%	45%
All Saints	58%	57%	42%
Grosv.	70%	85%	46%
St Marys	90%	94%	55%

Although classified as long stay car parks, users can purchase a short stay or long stay tariff in these car parks. These car parks have the greatest spare car parking capacity with approximately 100 spaces available at peak times.

- 1.4 Impact of the Home of Horse Racing
  - 1.4.1 The Home of Horse Racing (HOHR) has recently opened and they have estimated that the total number of visitors in the first year of business will be in the region of 52,000 people, with 1 in every 3 admissions arriving by car for an average stay of between 3-4 hrs.
  - 1.4.2 The capacity of Newmarket car parks to accommodate the increase in parking events arising from the HOHR was assessed as part of the review undertaken last year and it was concluded that the car parks would have enough capacity to absorb the increase in visitors and from natural growth of the local economy and housing. Based on the recent capacity counts and the level of capacity as identified in paragraph 1.3 of this report, we make no change to this assumption. Clearly the opening of the HOHR will enable us to monitor actual usage and should there be a significant variation to the visitor



assumptions, we will work with HOHR to deliver capacity.

#### 1.5 Pocket Car Parks

The District Council owns six Pocket Car Parks providing 68 spaces which are available for lease to local residents. The cost of renting a Pocket Car parking space was reduced from £300 to £150 plus VAT per annum last year. Since the change, the number of spaces occupied has increased from 48 to 56 as set out below:

<b>Pocket Car Park</b>	<b>Let Spaces</b>
All Saints	14/16 Spaces let
Queen Street	13/13 Full
Queen Street (Garage area)	3/3 Full
Granby Street (Small)	7/8 paces let
Granby Street (Friendship House)	12/16 Spaces let
Snooker Hall (All Saints)	0/5 Spaces Let
Rous Road	7/7 Full

Members should note that the Snooker Hall Pocket Car Park remains unoccupied and may wish to consider releasing these spaces to the general public mind-full of the potential car parking pressures arising from the Home of Horse Racing in this area of the town.

#### 1.6 Enforcement

A total of 1,214 Excess Charge Notices were issued in the first 9 months of 2016. Whilst the car parking service continues to develop an ambassadorial, customer focused approach to service delivery, inevitably the number of fines will increase as car parking events rise and enforcement has now extended to Sunday. Furthermore additional resource has been recruited to enforce the car parks. Nevertheless the number of fines issued over the course of this period equates to 0.2% of all car parking events, reinforcing that 99.8% of our customers understand and comply with our car parking regulations.

#### 1.7 Car Park Improvements

##### 1.7.1 Road Directional Signage

New road signs have been installed across Newmarket to direct vehicles to the short and long stay car parks. Included on the signs is car parking for the Home of Horse Racing.

### 1.7.2 New information Boards

All car park information and tariff boards have been revamped arising from the restriction and tariff changes made earlier in the year.

### 1.7.3 Improvements to Rous Road Car Park

Three new lighting columns have been added to Rous Road Park and all other existing light columns replaced with LED. In addition, the car park has been relined and accommodated an entrance into the Home of Horse Racing.

### 1.7.4 Electric Charging Points

Two Electric Charging Points have been ordered and will be installed in the Guineas Car Park in January 2017. The charging points, that are manufactured and operated by Charge Master, will provide a source of electric to enable a vehicle to be fully charged between 3-4hrs. Given the authority's commitment to the promotion of green energy, vehicles will not be charged for parking but required to pay a charge for the electric.

## 1.8 Park Mark

1.8.1 As in previous years, the Council's pay and display car parks have been independently inspected by the Police and parking specialists. The inspection considers the level of safety, cleanliness, quality of signage, frequency of patrols and uniformed attendants, and maintenance within our car parks. The District's car parks have again been recognised for their high quality of management with a Park Mark award.

## 1.9 On Street Parking

### 1.9.1 Residential Parking Zones

Suffolk County Council had resolved to review proposals for Newmarket Resident Parking Schemes in light of the impact of off street parking recommendations agreed at Cabinet in December 2015, and the opening of the Home of Horse Racing. Given that the Home of Horse racing has only recently opened, the scheme will now be reviewed in the spring of 2017 when the impact of additional visitor traffic can be fully assessed.

### 1.9.2 Civil Parking Enforcement

The Police, Suffolk County Council and District/Borough Councils in Suffolk are working up a business model for the transition of on-street parking enforcement in Suffolk from the police to local authorities. Such a change is known as Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE). The aim of the business case will be to ensure that an effective system is created, allowing all parking enforcement to be fully coordinated across the west and east of the county in addition to the current operation in Ipswich. FHDC would be responsible for enforcement of on and off street car parking and setting charges. Members

will be minded that the Newmarket High Street Design brief will consider the physical provision of parking in the High Street and once agreed, the management issues such as the introduction of pay and display parking will be considered in conjunction with the business case for CPE and Newmarket Masterplan process.

If agreed by all partners, the aim will be for transfer of powers to be fully operational across Suffolk by April 2019. This would be subject to the approval of the business case by FHDC Cabinet and a successful application to the Secretary of State for Transport.

## 1.10 Financial

1.10.1 Income for the first 6 months is £17,000 more than 2015 and is likely that total income generated from charges and fees will be £608,000 by the end of the financial year. This increase has been generated by more parking events, the introduction of Sunday charging and higher Excess Charge Notice fines. This additional income is contributing to the investment made in car parking provision and additional enforcement identified in this report

1.10.2 At the request of the Newmarket Retailers Association and agreed by the Operation Portfolio Holder, the car parking charge will be waived from 1pm on every Thursday through-out the month of December. This is in support of an initiative to attract more shoppers and visitors to the town over this important trading period. The loss of income will be approximately £2,600 and will be trailed for the first time this year. Data will be collected and the impact will be assessed.

### 1.11.1 Conclusion

The Car Park Review in 2015 focused on the ability to manage capacity, to provide a high quality service, to maintain affordable car parking and meet the challenges of the Mid Term Financial Strategy. Since the implementation of the recommendations set out in the review, we have seen an increase in car parking events, exceeded income targets whilst not increasing short stay tariffs, and have seen significant investment in car parking infrastructure and resource to enforce the car parks.

1.11.2 Clearly challenges are still to be delivered such as the management of car parking capacity to facilitate an increase in visitors to the Home of Horse Racing and addressing the enforcement of on street parking. Nevertheless this report sets out the processes that the District Council has in place to achieve positive outcomes.

## **2. Recommendations**

2.1 Members are asked to note the report; and instruct the Head of Operations under his delegated authority and in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Operations, to incorporate the Snooker Hall Pocket Car Park spaces into All Saints Car Park for use by pay and display customers.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



Forest Heath  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Review and Revision of the Constitution</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>OAS/FH/16/032</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	10 November 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Stephen Edwards Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance <b>Tel:</b> 01638 660518 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:stephen.edwards@forest-heath.gov.uk">stephen.edwards@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Steven Boyle Interim Service Manager (Legal and Democratic Services)/Monitoring Officer <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757165 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:steven.boyle@westsuffolk.gov.uk">steven.boyle@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To note the minor amendments made to the Forest Heath District Council Constitution arising from changes to legislation, changes to staffing structures/ job descriptions or changes in terminology.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the minor amendments undertaken by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority, as set out in Appendix A to this report, be <u>noted</u>.</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>  (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b><u>do not</u></b> 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"/>	
<b>Consultation:</b>	• Not applicable.	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	• Not applicable.	
<b>Implications:</b>		
Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the Monitoring Officer is responsible for the operation of the Council's Constitution.  Under S37 of the Local Government Act 2000, a local authority which is operating executive arrangements, must prepare and keep up-to-date, a document (referred to as their constitution).	
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b>		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
<b>Risk area</b>	<b>Inherent level of risk</b> (before controls)	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)
Confusion, mistakes and legal challenge if delegations in the Constitution do not reflect actual Council and Officer practice	High	Ongoing review and revision to ensure that the Constitution is up-to-date	Low
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>		All Wards	
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		<a href="#">Forest Heath District Council Constitution</a>	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		Appendix A – Minor Amendments made to the Constitution by the Monitoring Officer under Delegated Authority - July to September 2016	

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation(s)**

### **1.1 Heading**

1.1.1 Article 14 of the Forest Heath District Council Constitution refers to the review and revision of the Constitution.

1.1.2 Paragraph 14.1.1 of Article 14 states that:

*"14.1.1 The Monitoring Officer will monitor and evaluate the operation of the Constitution to ensure that its aims and principles are given full effect."*

1.1.3 Paragraph 14.4.3 of Article 14 also states that:

*"14.3.3 The Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Head of Paid Service and relevant Portfolio Holder, has delegated authority to make minor amendments to the constitution arising from changes to legislation, changes to staffing structures or job descriptions or changes in terminology. Such changes will be reported quarterly to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Monitoring Officer also has authority to amend the constitution to implement decisions of the Leader in relation to the delegation of executive functions to the Cabinet."*

1.1.4 **Appendix A** to this report sets out the minor amendments which have been made to the Forest Heath District Council Constitution, under the delegated authority of the Monitoring Officer, from July to September 2016.

1.1.5 All Members of the Council have also been informed of these minor amendments, as part of the ongoing review and revision of the Constitution. The latest updated version of the Constitution is also available on the Council's website and is available for inspection by members of the public, upon request.

## Forest Heath District Council

### Review and Revision of the Constitution

#### Minor Amendments made by the Monitoring Officer under Delegated Authority (July to September 2016)

Amendment Date	Approved By	Sections of the Constitution Affected	Nature of Amendment
August 2016	Monitoring Officer	Part 1(b) Forest Heath District Council Membership 2015-2019	The membership information was updated to include the following Councillor contact information as result of the District Council By-Elections held on 5 May 2016: (i) Cllr Roger Dicker (South Ward) (ii) Cllr Victor Lukaniuk (Brandon West Ward)
August 2016	Monitoring Officer	Part 2 (Articles) (f) Article 6 – The Cabinet	Appendix A (List of Portfolio Responsibilities) within this Article was amended to reflect the areas of responsibility under the Leader of the Council Portfolio (in line with Part 3 Functions and Responsibilities – Section 3: Responsibility for Cabinet functions).





This page is intentionally left blank

# Overview and Scrutiny of Committee



<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Work Programme Update</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>OAS/FH/16/033</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	10 November 2016
<b>Chairman of the Committee:</b>	Simon Cole Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee <b>Tel:</b> 07974 443762 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:simon.cole@forest-heath.gov.uk">simon.cole@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Christine Brain Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny) <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719729 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk">Christine.brain@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To update the Committee on the current status of its rolling work programme of annual items for scrutiny during 2017 ( <b>Appendix 1</b> ).	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee:</b>  <b>That, Members <u>note</u> the current status of the work programme and the annual items expected during 2017.</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b> (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> 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"/>	
<b>Documents attached:</b>	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 the next few months is attached at **Appendix 1** for information.

#### 1.1.3 Mildenhall Hub Update

1.1.4 Further to previous decisions by the Council and its partners, design work continues on the Mildenhall Hub in accordance with the aim of submitting a planning application in 2017. A pre-application consultation on concept designs will take place in November and December 2016, to seek public and stakeholder views, and councillors will be invited to take part in that process. The outcomes of that consultation will inform the next stages of the design and also the cost estimates that will be used to prepare the final budget for Forest Heath and the other partners.

It is expected that this Committee will consider a draft financial business case at its January 2017 meeting, when there is more certainty on the costs and also sources of funding, as well as the outcomes of the latest public consultation.

1.1.5 Members are asked to note the current status of its work programme for 2017.

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Rolling Work Programme (Forest Heath District 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 Officer	Details
<b>12 January 2017</b>		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Leisure and Culture	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to give a short presentation / account of their portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.
Mildenhall Hub Financial Business Case	Director	To scrutinise the Financial Business Case for the Mildenhall Hub Project
West Suffolk Housing Strategy	Head of Housing	To receive a progress report against action points.
Designated Public Place Orders in Brandon and Newmarket and Change to Public Space Protection Orders	Head of Families and Communities	To scrutinise proposed conditions and changes to the Designated Public Place Orders in Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill and Change to Public Space Protection Orders, as required by legislation.
Review and Revision of the Constitution (Quarter 3)	Monitoring Officer	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)	Monitoring Officer	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)	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	Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

<b>Description</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>16 March 2017</b>		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Resources and Performance <i>To be confirmed</i>	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to give a short presentation / account of their portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.
West Suffolk Information Strategy	Head of Resources and Performance	To scrutinise a West Suffolk Information Strategy, which has been jointly produced with St Edmundsbury Borough Council.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)	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	Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.
<b>20 April 2017</b>		
Annual Portfolio Holder Presentation	Families and Communities <i>To be confirmed</i>	The Portfolio Holder has been invited to give a short presentation / account of their portfolio and answer questions from the Committee.
Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership	Community Safety Co-ordinator	To review the work of the Partnership on an annual basis.
Review and Revision of the Constitution (Quarter 4)	Monitoring Officer	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)	Monitoring Officer	To scrutinise the authority's use of its surveillance powers on a quarterly basis.
Cabinet Decision Plan	Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)	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	Democratic Services Officer (Scrutiny)	To receive suggestions for scrutiny reviews, appoint Task and Finish Groups for these reviews and indicate review timescales.

Future items identified to be programmed:

1. Tree Preservation Orders
2. Draft West Suffolk Strategic Plan 2017-2020

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank