

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Agenda</b>												
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Tuesday 13 December 2016</b>												
<b>Time:</b>	<b>6.00 pm</b>												
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Council Chamber District Offices</b> College Heath Road Mildenhall												
<b>Membership:</b>	<p><b>Leader</b> James Waters</p> <p><b>Deputy Leader</b> Robin Millar</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><b><u>Councillor</u></b></th> <th><b><u>Portfolio</u></b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>David Bowman</td> <td>Operations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stephen Edwards</td> <td>Resources and Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Andy Drummond</td> <td>Leisure and Culture</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Robin Millar</td> <td>Families and Communities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lance Stanbury</td> <td>Planning and Growth</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b><u>Councillor</u></b>	<b><u>Portfolio</u></b>	David Bowman	Operations	Stephen Edwards	Resources and Performance	Andy Drummond	Leisure and Culture	Robin Millar	Families and Communities	Lance Stanbury	Planning and Growth
<b><u>Councillor</u></b>	<b><u>Portfolio</u></b>												
David Bowman	Operations												
Stephen Edwards	Resources and Performance												
Andy Drummond	Leisure and Culture												
Robin Millar	Families and Communities												
Lance Stanbury	Planning and Growth												
<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>Sharon Turner</b> Democratic Services Officer (Cabinet) <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719237 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:sharon.turner@westsuffolk.gov.uk">sharon.turner@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>	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. A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start. There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.	
<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>	The Council may record this meeting and permits members of the public and media to record or broadcast it as well (when the media and public are not lawfully excluded).  Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Administrator who will instruct that they are not included in the filming.	

# Agenda

## Procedural Matters

**1. Apologies for Absence**

**2. Minutes**

**1 - 22**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 11 October 2016 (Extraordinary meeting), 25 October 2016, 1 November 2016 and 22 November 2016 (Extraordinary meeting) (attached).

## Part 1 - Public

**3. Open Forum**

At each Cabinet meeting, up to 15 minutes shall be allocated for questions from and discussion with, non-Cabinet members. Members wishing to speak during this session should if possible, give notice in advance. Who speaks and for how long will be at the complete discretion of the person presiding.

**4. Public Participation**

Members of the public who live or work in the District are invited to put one question/statement of not more than three minutes duration relating to items to be discussed in Part 1 of the agenda only. If a question is asked and answered within three minutes, the person who asked the question may ask a supplementary question that arises from the reply.

A person who wishes to speak must register at least 15 minutes before the time the meeting is scheduled to start.

There is an overall time limit of 15 minutes for public speaking, which may be extended at the Chairman's discretion.

**5. Report of the Extraordinary Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 20 October 2016**

**23 - 26**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/052**

Chairman: Simon Cole  
Portfolio Holder: Lance Stanbury

Lead Officer: Christine Brain

- 6. Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:  
10 November 2016** **27 - 32**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/053**  
Chairman: Simon Cole Lead Officer: Christine Brain
  
- 7. Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny  
Committee - 10 November 2016: Barley Homes Five Year  
Business Plan** **33 - 36**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/054**  
Portfolio Holder: Sara Mildmay-White (West Suffolk Lead Member for  
Housing)  
Chairman of the Committee: Simon Cole Lead Officer: Rachael Mann
  
- 8. Report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee:  
24 November 2016** **37 - 42**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/055**  
Portfolio Holder: Stephen Edwards Lead Officer: Christine Brain  
Chairman of the Committee: Louis Busuttil
  
- 9. Recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny  
Committee - 24 November 2016: Delivering a Sustainable  
Budget Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/2020** **43 - 50**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/056**  
Portfolio Holder: Stephen Edwards Lead Officer: Rachael Mann  
Chairman of the Committee: Louis Busuttil
  
- 10. Recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny  
Committee - 24 November 2016: Mid-Year Treasury  
Management Report and Investment Activity (April to  
September 2016)** **51 - 54**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/057**  
Portfolio Holder: Stephen Edwards Lead Officer: Rachael Mann  
Chairman of the Committee: Louis Busuttil
  
- 11. Recommendations of the Licensing and Regulatory  
Committee - 10 October 2016: Training for Hackney  
Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Drivers** **55 - 60**

Report No: **CAB/FH/16/058**  
Portfolio Holder: Lance Stanbury Lead Officer: Peter Gudde  
Chairman of the Committee: Michael Anderson

	<i><b>Page No</b></i>
<p><b>12. Recommendations of the Local Plan Working Group - 28 November 2016: Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR), Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission Documents and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)</b></p> <p>Report No: <b>CAB/FH/16/059</b></p> <p>Portfolio Holder: Lance Stanbury Chairman of the Working Group: Rona Burt      Lead Officer: Marie Smith</p>	<p><b>61 - 72</b></p>
<p><b>13. Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2017/2018</b></p> <p>Report No: <b>CAB/FH/16/060</b></p> <p>Portfolio Holder: Stephen Edwards      Lead Officer: Rachael Mann</p>	<p><b>73 - 80</b></p>
<p><b>14. Council Tax Base for Tax Setting Purposes 2017/2018</b></p> <p>Report No: <b>CAB/FH/16/061</b></p> <p>Portfolio Holder: Stephen Edwards      Lead Officer: Rachael Mann</p>	<p><b>81 - 92</b></p>
<p><b>15. Allocation of Community Chest Funding 2017/2018</b></p> <p>Report No: <b>CAB/FH/16/062</b></p> <p>Portfolio Holder: Robin Millar      Lead Officer: Davina Howes</p>	<p><b>93 - 102</b></p>
<p><b>16. Location Filming in Suffolk</b></p> <p>Report No: <b>CAB/FH/16/063</b></p> <p>Portfolio Holder: Lance Stanbury      Lead Officer: Andrea Mayley</p>	<p><b>103 - 116</b></p>
<p><b>17. Decisions Plan: December 2016 to May 2017</b></p> <p>Report No: <b>CAB/FH/16/064</b></p> <p>To consider the most recently published version of the Cabinet's Decisions Plan</p> <p>Portfolio Holder: James Waters      Lead Officer: Ian Gallin</p>	<p><b>117 - 128</b></p>

This page is intentionally left blank

# Extraordinary Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

**Minutes** of a extraordinary meeting of the **Cabinet** held on  
**Tuesday 11 October 2016** at **6.00 pm** at the **Council Chamber, District**  
**Offices**, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, IP28 7EY

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** James Waters

David Bowman  
Andy Drummond

Stephen Edwards  
Lance Stanbury

**In Attendance:**

Ruth Allen  
Andrew Appleby  
Chris Barker  
John Bloodworth  
Rona Burt  
Louis Busuttil

Simon Cole  
Brian Harvey  
Victor Lukaniuk  
Carol Lynch  
Nigel Roman

236. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Robin Millar.

237. **Open Forum**

Hatchfield Farm: Secretary of State Decision – Next Steps (Report No: CAB/FH/16/042)

The following non-Cabinet Members spoke on this item (as summarised below):

(a) Councillor Rona Burt

Councillor Burt addressed the Cabinet and expressed her disappointment with the Secretary of State's decision to refuse planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket. She referred to the former Secretary of State's previous statement in relation to planning matters where he had stated that "*locally elected members should make the decisions on planning applications in their District.*"

Councillor Burt explained that the villages which she represented within her Ward were now all very concerned regarding this decision and the impact that this would have on their villages. Councillor Burt also

raised her concerns of the impact which this decision would have on the Council's housing figures within its Local Plan.

(b) Councillor Carol Lynch

Councillor Lynch addressed the Cabinet and explained that she had previously represented Newmarket on the Council for 16 years and had also been the lead Member for Housing. She expressed her gratitude to the Secretary of State for being mindful regarding housing development in Newmarket, but there was a need for housing, albeit of a sensitive nature. There were no available brownfield sites in Newmarket which can be used for the provision of additional housing. It was very important to keep the paddock land, along with the continued support of the Council's Horseracing Policies, as they were paramount to the protection of the horseracing industry. The Hatchfield Farm site was in the right location for the provision of additional housing in the town.

Councillor Lynch also referred to the importance of horseracing to Newmarket, but there needed to be a balance between horses and the people. In her view, the surrounding villages and other settlements were being asked to allocate too much additional housing.

Councillor Lynch concluded by requesting for the Cabinet to continue to support the decision of the Council's Development Control Committee for the approval of planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket.

(c) Councillor Victor Lukaniuk

Councillor Lukaniuk addressed the Cabinet and stated that if Members believed the decision to approve planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket, had been the right decision, then the Council should challenge the Secretary of State accordingly.

(d) Councillor Ruth Allen

Councillor Allen addressed the Cabinet and stated that the residents of Newmarket considered that the town needed growth and Hatchfield Farm was an ideal location for these homes to be built. The development also offered additional cycle routes and footpaths and improved highway infrastructure. Councillor Allen considered that the residents and the horseracing community should be able to work together, in harmony, to make this development work effectively.

Councillor Allen stated that this decision by the Secretary of State should be challenged by the Council, which would show to the residents of Newmarket that the future development of the town was a priority.

(e) Councillor Andrew Appleby

Councillor Appleby addressed the Cabinet and stated that the horseracing industry was valued by the Council, however, the decision



to over-rule the Council's planning decision for the approval of 400 homes at Hatchfield farm, Newmarket and the subsequent Planning Inspector's conclusions endorsing the Council's decision, was unlawful. In particular, the current Secretary of State's view was inconsistent with the former who had accepted that 1,200 homes would not prejudice the horseracing industry.

Councillor Appleby concluded that the Council must have faith in its own planning decisions, along with the Planning Inspector's conclusions and he believed that the Council must challenge the decision by the Secretary of State to refuse planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket.

(f) Councillor Simon Cole

Councillor Cole addressed the Cabinet and stated that he considered the Council should challenge the Secretary of State's decision to refuse planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket. One of the reasons for this was that the Council had made a democratic decision to approve this planning application, being the Local Planning Authority and that the challenge would reinforce this democratic decision.

In his view, he considered that the development at Hatchfield Farm would not damage the horseracing industry, but in fact would damage it more if these homes were not built. It appeared that the Jockey Club was not totally adverse to house building at it was currently looking itself to build 100 homes in Hamilton Road, as housing was needed in the town.

Councillor Cole concluded that the Council should challenge the Secretary of State's decision to refuse planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket.

## 238. **Public Participation**

### Hatchfield Farm: Secretary of State Decision – Next Steps (Report No: CAB/FH/16/042)

The following members of the public spoke on this item (as summarised below):

(a) Councillor Bill Rampling (Chairman, Moulton Parish Council and on behalf of the Forest Heath Rural Parish Alliance)

Councillor Rampling addressed the Cabinet and confirmed that he was representing the Forest Heath Rural Parish Alliance and Moulton Parish Council who were supporting Lord Derby in challenging the Secretary of State's decision. He hoped that the Cabinet would also take the decision to join this challenge.

Councillor Rampling then asked a question of the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Lance Stanbury, this being:

*'If the challenge was unsuccessful and the Secretary of State ruling stood, would the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, have to start the local plan process again?.'*

Councillor Rampling further stated that the Council's Core Strategy was based on the premise that the majority of the houses to be built would be in the most sustainable locations, ie the three market towns (Brandon, Mildenhall and Newmarket). However, Brandon was severely constrained for ecological reasons and if Newmarket could only be developed according to the wishes of the horseracing industry, where were the new houses going to be built.

Councillor Lance Stanbury then replied to the question raised and confirmed that the local plan process would not have to be started again. The Council's Local Plan Working Group would be exploring all available options for growth within the District. Councillor Stanbury also stated that, at this stage, he was unable to confirm where the new homes were to be built as this was subject to due process, however, he would be speaking to this point later in his address to the Cabinet.

(b) Dr Allan Marchington (Resident of Herringswell)

Dr Marchington addressed the Cabinet and requested that the Council continued to support the decisions made regarding the provision of homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket. He explained that, over two years ago, a democratic decision had been made, based on evidence, to approve 400 homes on Hatchfield Farm by the Council's Planning Committee. This decision had been challenged by the horseracing industry and by the local MP, who requested for this decision to be called-in by the Secretary of State. Following a public enquiry, the Planning Inspector agreed with the Council's decision and had determined, based on evidence, that 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm would not be detrimental to the horseracing industry.

In August 2016, the Secretary of State refused planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, due to the perception of damage to the horseracing industry from this application, thereby overruling both the Council and the Planning Inspector's decisions. The effect of refusing this planning permission now meant that Newmarket would not receive the much needed infrastructure improvements, contributions towards primary education and provision of additional sports/community facilities.

Dr Marchington requested that the Council continued to follow the sequential process of the local plan and to support its local residents in their desire for sustainable development. He requested for the Cabinet to stand by the Council's decision to provide housing on Hatchfield Farm, to prevent the situation whereby the perception of damage was allowed to determine where housing was provided in the District. In his view, there was no evidence to support this perception and should be challenged and requested that the Cabinet considered joining Lord

Derby and the Rural Parish Alliance in a High Court challenge of the Secretary of State's decision.

(c) Councillor Rupert Osborn (Chairman, Worlington Parish Council)

Councillor Osborn addressed the Cabinet and explained that his representations were of his own personal views as a resident of Forest Heath and as Chairman of Worlington Parish Council.

Councillor Osborn stated strongly that the Council should support Lord Derby in his appeal against the Secretary of State's decision to refuse planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket. Having read in detail, the comprehensive report of the Planning Inspector, Councillor Osborn was of the opinion that the development should have been allowed. All the relevant issues had been explored in the Planning Inspector's judgment, which had concluded that there would be no negative impact on the horseracing industry. Councillor Osborn considered that with the proposed infrastructure changes and provision of new and much needed affordable homes in Newmarket, the impact of this development would have been positive and would have assisted with encouraging people to be able to both live and work in the town.

Councillor Osborn also referred to the wider planning consequences for the District, as a result of the Secretary of State's decision. He expressed his concerns in relation to the planning constraints already in existence which prevented development, along with concerns that further restrictions in Newmarket could mean that the surrounding towns/villages may have to take further additional development. The village of Worlington was already being affected by increased traffic and any additional development may make this situation worse.

Councillor Osborn concluded by stating that the Council had previously decided that development on Hatchfield Farm was appropriate. Therefore the Council should support Lord Derby in his appeal, for the sake of the District as a whole.

(d) Ralph Brownie (Resident of Cavenham)

Mr Brownie addressed the Cabinet as a ratepayer from the village of Cavenham.

Mr Brownie acknowledged the responsibilities and difficulties placed upon the Council when trying to provide significant numbers of additional housing within the District. The proposals for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm had met all the criteria for a sustainable development, in an ideal location which offered both infrastructure improvements and opportunities for employment. This location was also already adjacent to existing cycleways and public transport routes in the town.

By adopting the Hatchfield Farm proposals, the Council would also have had the opportunity to access S106 monies for the improvement of access along the A142/A14 intersection. The modelling of the

proposed infrastructure improvements, by Suffolk County Council, had shown that the overall movement of traffic would have been of benefit to all road users, including the horseracing community.

Mr Brownie raised concerns on the already increased traffic levels on the roads, particularly from small/medium sized developments which were bringing more cars to each and every village in the County. A significant amount of this additional rural traffic was as a result of commuting into the main towns, such as Newmarket.

Mr Brownie referred to the future medium/long term plans for Newmarket, which included the increasing of facilities, such as an uphill gallop, with the express objective of increasing the number of associated horseracing training opportunities within the town. Therefore, unless homes were placed within an accessible and sustainable location, such as Hatchfield Farm, there would continue to be a problem of ever increasing traffic on both rural roads and arterial routes throughout the town.

Mr Brownie concluded that that the Council had a duty to its ratepayers to challenge the Secretary of State's decision to refuse planning permission for 400 homes at Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket.

**239. Hatchfield Farm: Secretary of State Decision - Next Steps (Report No: CAB/FH/16/042)**

Councillor Lance Stanbury, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth, presented this report in which the Cabinet were requested to decide whether to pursue a High Court Challenge to the Secretary of State's decision to refuse to grant planning permission for up to 400 dwellings, with associated infrastructure, in relation to Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket, taking into account the outcomes of the legal advice sought (this legal advice was subsequently circulated at the meeting).

Councillor Stanbury explained the Council's frustrations, as the Local Planning Authority, as to the effect of the refusal of this application on the Forest Heath district as a whole. Since the Secretary of State's decision, work had been undertaken in the consideration of the available options and how these would affect all of the Council's communities, in order to be able to make the right decision for everyone in Forest Heath. Councillor Stanbury then outlined these options and the subsequent effects (whether positive or negative).

If the Council was to enter into a High Court Challenge then this would positively maintain that Newmarket was the most sustainable town and location for growth and there was likely to be less challenge to the Local Plan from Lord Derby and other interested parties.

The challenge would incur further legal costs to the council tax payer. There would be a further delay to the completion of the Local Plan, which could not be adopted by the end of 2017 as planned. Not being able to adopt the Plan would mean the loss of the New Homes Bonus and also under new planning legislation, the Secretary of State could intervene with the Plan if progress

was not made. It would also leave the Council open to speculative planning applications in the District, as the Plan would be out-of-date.

If the Council was not to enter into a High Court Challenge then there would be no additional cost to the council tax payer. The Council would be able to continue with the Local Plan for adoption by the end of 2017. Taking into account the planning permissions granted since April 2016, the Council only needed to find sites to accommodate 145 homes to make up for the loss of the Hatchfield Farm site (this equated to less than 10 homes a year over the remaining 15 years of the Plan period). However, Lord Derby and other interested parties could still decide to challenge the Local Plan.

Therefore, Councillor Stanbury firstly proposed to the Cabinet, that Forest Heath District Council did not seek to challenge the Secretary of State's decision in regard to Hatchfield Farm development, but remained an interested party in the claim of Moulton Parish Council, on behalf of themselves and the Rural Parish Alliance and the Earl of Derby.

Councillor Stanbury then went on to highlight the opportunities which he considered were now available. He explained that the Secretary of State had recognised that Newmarket was a unique place and of great importance to the national economy and a meeting was being arranged with him to discuss Newmarket in the wider setting.

There was a huge opportunity for all parts of the community to work together to create a new prospectus for Newmarket and its community (ie businesses, the local community, the Town Council and established working groups) to feed into the preparation of the new Local Plan. Such a process and prospectus would provide valuable evidence to support the next Local Plan, which would commence in early 2018. Therefore, Councillor Stanbury secondly proposed to the Cabinet, that Forest Heath District Council led a process looking to the future of the town and for the Cabinet to invite the whole community to join with the Council and work together to develop an existing new Prospectus for Newmarket, that brought together all the different planning and visioning work that was taking place across the town and district.

The remaining Cabinet Members then took the opportunity to also speak on this item and supported Councillor Stanbury's proposal not to seek to challenge the Secretary of State's decision, for the reasons previously stated and also supported the proposal for the creation of a new prospectus for Newmarket.

Prior to the voting on this item, the Council's Lawyer advised the Cabinet that as an application to challenge the Secretary of State's decision had to be made by the deadline of 12 October 2016, the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed that the decision should be exempted from the Call-in procedure, as it was both reasonable for the Council to take such a decision now in all the circumstances and to the decision being treated as a matter of urgency (in line with Part 4: Overview and Scrutiny Committees Procedure Rules; paragraph 14.4 of the Council's Constitution).

The proposals made by Councillor Stanbury were then seconded by Councillor Andy Drummond and with the vote being unanimous, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That:-

1. Forest Heath District Council does not seek to challenge the Secretary of State's decision in regard to the Hatchfield Farm development, but to remain an interested party in the claim of Moulton Parish Council, on behalf of themselves and the Rural Parish Alliance and the Earl of Derby.
  
2. Forest Heath District Council to lead a process looking to the future of the Town. The Cabinet to invite the whole community to join with the Council and work together to develop an exciting new Prospectus for Newmarket that brings together all the different planning and visioning work that is taking place across the Town and District.

The Meeting concluded at 6.45 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Cabinet** held on  
**Tuesday 25 October 2016** at **6.00 pm** at the **Council Chamber, District**  
**Offices**, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, IP28 7EY

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** James Waters  
**Vice Chairman** Robin Millar

David Bowman  
Andy Drummond

Stephen Edwards  
Lance Stanbury

**By Invitation:**

Simon Cole

(Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny  
Committee)

Ruth Bowman

(Vice Chairman of the Overview and  
Scrutiny Committee)

Louis Busuttil

(Chairman of the Performance and Audit  
Scrutiny Committee)

**240. Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

**241. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 13 September 2016 and 20 September 2016 were unanimously confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**242. Open Forum**

No non-Cabinet Members in attendance wished to speak under this item.

**243. Public Participation**

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

**244. Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 15 September 2016  
(Report No: CAB/FH/16/043)**

Councillor Simon Cole, Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, presented this report which informed the Cabinet of the following items which had been discussed by the Committee on 15 September 2016 and also drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet:

- (1) Annual Presentation by the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth.
- (2) Approach to Delivering a Sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020 and Consideration of the Four-Year Settlement Offer from Central Government. (*The recommendations in relation to this item, had been considered at the Cabinet meeting on 20 September 2016*).
- (3) Local Air Quality Strategy Progress Report (2015-2016).
- (4) Final Report of the New Housing Development Sites Joint Task and Finish Group.
- (5) Decisions Plan: September 2016 to May 2017.
- (6) Work Programme Update.

Councillor Cole also reported an error within paragraph 1.3.8 of the report and explained that the recommendation which referred to the 'Head of Operations' should actually read the 'Head of Planning and Growth'.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That the contents of Report No CAB/FH/16/043, being the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, be noted.

**245. Report of the Anglia Revenues and Benefits Partnership Joint Committee: 20 September 2016 (Report No: CAB/FH/16/044)**

The Cabinet received this report which informed them of the following items which had been discussed by the Anglia Revenues and Benefits Partnership Joint Committee on 20 September 2016:

- (1) Performance Report.
- (2) Welfare Reform Update.
- (3) ARP Health and Safety Policy.
- (4) ARP Transformation Programme.
- (5) Forthcoming Issues; and
- (6) Exempt: Commercial and Partnership Update

Councillor Edwards also drew Members attention to paragraph 1.1.5 of the report which explained that the Partnership currently had an underspend of £219,064 against budget and the reasons for the specific variances had been reported to the Joint Committee accordingly.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That the contents of the report be noted.



246. **Report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 22 September 2016 (Report No: CAB/FH/16/045)**

Councillor Louis Busuttil, Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, presented this report which informed the Cabinet of the following items which had been discussed by the Committee on 22 September 2016 and also drew relevant issues to the attention of the Cabinet:

- (1) Ernst and Young – Presentation of 2015-2016 ISA260 Annual Results Report to those Charged with Governance.
- (2) West Suffolk Annual Governance Statement 2015-2016.
- (3) 2015-2016 Annual Statement of Accounts.
- (4) Arrangements for Appointment of External Auditors. *(This item was subject to a separate report on the agenda – Report No CAB/FH/16/046).*
- (5) Work Programme Update.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That the contents of the report be noted.

247. **Recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee - 22 September 2016: Arrangements for Appointment of External Auditors (Report No: CAB/FH/16/046)**

Councillor Louis Busuttil, Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, presented this report which asked the Cabinet to consider the options available for appointing External Auditors in time to make the first appointment by 31 December 2017, following the closure of the Audit Commission and the end of the transitional arrangements.

The Cabinet were informed that it was the Council's statutory responsibility to appoint a local auditor to audit its 2018-2019 accounts by 31 December 2017. In meeting this statutory responsibility, the Council could choose one of the following options:

1. Establish a stand-alone Auditor Panel to make the appointment on behalf of the Council.
2. Commence work on exploring the establishment of local joint procurement arrangements with neighbouring authorities.
3. Use an existing independent panel of the Authority (this would only be applicable where a suitably constituted plan already existed).

The Committee had been provided with the advantages and disadvantages for each of the three options, including risk management and legal/financial implications.

The Council had only to December 2017 to make an appointment, which meant that one of the three options would need to be in place by Spring 2017 in order that the contract negotiation process could be carried out during 2017.

The Committee had been advised that Option 3 would provide for better economies of scale in keeping audit fees down and having a Suffolk Wide auditor.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

**RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:** (21 December 2016)

That Option 3, to 'opt-in' to the sector led body (Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited (PSAA)) for the independent appointment of the Council's External Auditor, beginning with responsibilities for the financial year 2018-2019, as set out in Report No PAS/FH/16/023, be approved.

**248. Decisions Plan: October 2016 to May 2017 (Report No: CAB/FH/16/047)**

The Cabinet considered this report which was the Cabinet Decisions Plan covering the period October 2016 to May 2017.

Members took the opportunity to review the intended forthcoming decisions of the Cabinet. However, no further information or amendments were requested on this occasion.

**249. Revenues Collection and Performance Write-Offs (Report No: CAB/FH/16/048)**

Councillor Stephen Edwards, Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance, presented this report which sought approval for the write-off of uncollectable amounts in respect of Council Tax, Business Rates and Housing Benefit overpayments.

The Portfolio Holder referred to paragraph 1.5 of the report which explained that the Council was working with the Local Government Association (LGA) for legislation changes which would support the prevention of businesses building up large amounts of unpaid business rates.

Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the report also set out the collection rates for the National Non Domestic Rates (NNDR) and Council Tax as at 30 September 2016.

The Cabinet also considered the exempt Appendices to this report and as reference was to be made to specific detail, these discussions, were held in private session (see Minute Number 251. below).

250. **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

It was proposed, seconded and

**RESOLVED:**

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Act.

251. **Exempt Appendices 1, 2 and 3: Revenues Collection Performance and Write-Offs (paras 1 and 2) (Report No: CAB/FH/16/048)**

The Cabinet considered the exempt Appendices to Report No CAB/FH/16/048, where reference was made to the specific detail contained within these Appendices.

With the vote being unanimous, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That the write-off of the amounts detailed in the exempt Appendices to Report No CAB/FH/16/048, be approved, as follows:

1. Exempt Appendix 1: Council Tax totalling £5,709.68
2. Exempt Appendix 2: Business Rates totalling £74,715.96
3. Exempt Appendix 3: Overpayment of Housing Benefit totalling £5,809.18.

The Meeting concluded at 6.15 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

# (Informal Joint) Cabinet



Forest Heath  
District Council

**Notes** of informal discussions of the SEBC/FHDC **Cabinets** held on **Tuesday 1 November 2016** at **6.00 pm** in the **Conference Chamber West, West Suffolk House**, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, IP33 3YU

**Present:**                      **Councillors**

Forest Heath District Council (FHDC)

David Bowman	Stephen Edwards
Andy Drummond	Robin Millar

St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC)

John Griffiths (in the Chair for the informal discussions)

Robert Everitt	Jo Rayner
Sara Mildmay-White	Peter Stevens
Alaric Pugh	

**In attendance:**            Susan Glossop (SEBC)

Prior to the formal meeting, informal discussions took place on the following substantive item:

- (1) Investing in our Leisure Provision in West Suffolk and Establishing a Long Term Strategic Approach and Reduced Management Fee with Abbeycroft Leisure.

All Members of Forest Heath District Council's Cabinet had been invited to attend St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Offices at West Suffolk House to enable joint informal discussions on the report to take place between the two authorities, prior to seeking formal approval at their respective separate Cabinet meetings, immediately following the informal discussions.

The Chairman, and Leader of St Edmundsbury Borough Council, welcomed all those present to West Suffolk House and the interim Service Manager (Legal and Democratic Services) advised on the format of the proceedings for the informal discussions and subsequent separate meetings of each authority.

Under their Constitutions, both Cabinets listed as standing agenda items: an 'Open Forum', which provided the opportunity for non-Cabinet Members to discuss issues with Cabinet and also 'Public Participation', which provided the

opportunity for members of the public to speak. Therefore, as any matters arising from the discussions held during these agenda items may have some bearing on the decisions taking during the separate formal meetings, non-Cabinet Members and members of the public were invited to put their questions/statements prior to the start of the joint informal discussions.

### 1. **Open Forum**

No non-Cabinet Members in attendance wished to speak.

### 2. **Public Participation**

There were no members of the public in attendance.

### 3. **Investing in our Leisure Provision in West Suffolk and Establishing a Long Term Strategic Approach and Reduced Management Fee with Abbeycroft Leisure. (Report Nos: CAB/SE/16/055 and CAB/FH/16/049)**

The Cabinets considered the above report, which sought approval for a number of recommendations relating to:

- (a) the creation of a strategic investment fund of £5m across West Suffolk (£3.5m FHDC and £1.5m SEBC);
- (b) the longer term strategic approach to leisure provision in West Suffolk through the future development of a leisure partnership agreement for consideration by the Cabinets; and
- (c) specific investments in Skyliner Sports Centre from SEBC, and Newmarket Leisure Centre from FHDC.

SEBC Cabinet Members confirmed that they had received an amended version of Report No: CAB/SE/16/055, which provided amended recommendations and textual changes to paragraphs 2.3 and 3.1 of the main body of the original report. The amendments to the recommendations were as follows, as indicated with shaded text:

*It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:*

- (1) *recommends to Council the creation of a strategic investment fund of £5m, funded from the strategic priorities and medium term financial strategy reserve, across West Suffolk (£3.5m FHDC and £1.5m SEBC) with delegated authority given to Cabinet (for sums of £500,000 or more), and delegation to the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture, in conjunction with a Director and the Head of Resources and Performance (for sums of less than £500,000), to draw down from this fund subject to satisfactory business case for each investment proposal for investment in the Council's leisure facilities;*
- (2) *approves the development of a long-term leisure partnership agreement (supported by a business plan) for consideration at a future Cabinet meeting that must address:*

- *the principles of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and value for money considerations;*
- *the outcomes of the Promoting Physical Activity Framework;*
- *the planned utilisation of the investment (established in recommendation (1)) to achieve the reduction in the management fee payable by the Council to zero;*
- *the optimum duration of the agreement; and*
- *the principles set out in Section 2.1 of Report No CAB/SE/16/055.*

**(3)** *Due to the urgency of initial funding requests, it is also recommended that Cabinet:*

- (a) recommends to Council approval for an additional £177,582 (ex VAT)[note that final negotiations with Suffolk County Council are progressing and this figure will be confirmed at the meeting] funding from unallocated capital receipts for the 3G pitch at Skyliner Sports Centre to meet the additional cost incurred to deliver a 3G pitch facility to meet FA and community requirements; and*
- (b) approves an investment of £240,000 (ex VAT) into equipment for the Skyliner Sports Centre from the Council's approved capital invest to save fund.*

Members noted that no changes had been made to the recommendations contained in the FHDC version of the report (Report No: CAB/FH/16/049), and that the figure of £177,582 funding required for the 3G pitch at Skyliner Sports Centre as detailed in Recommendation (3)(a) above was a confirmed amount.

Councillors Andy Drummond and Joanna Rayner, FHDC's and SEBC's respective Portfolio Holders for Leisure and Culture, drew relevant issues to the attention of both Cabinets, including that in recognition of the continued financial challenges in the public sector and that the pressure in the longer term could be worsened with the uncertainty of local government finances, it was proposed to bring the Councils' leisure services provider in line with their own longer term strategic planning approach regarding striving towards self-sufficiency. The proposal for developing a new long term leisure partnership agreement would need to address specific issues, as set out in recommendation (2) above.

In line with the above, Members noted that the creation of an investment fund of £5m would act as an enabler for delivering a zero management fee in the medium to longer term, through schemes that would provide new capacity or upgraded facilities.

In respect of issues that need addressing in the shorter term, the Cabinets considered the following in relation to specific investment proposals located with their own district/borough:

- (a) SEBC: Skyliner Sports Centre. Proposal for an immediate allocation of £240,000 (ex VAT) on an 'invest to save' basis for provision of new gymnasium equipment at Skyliner Sports Centre, which would in turn provide a reduction in management fee of £40,000 from 2017/18 onwards and represented a return on investment of 16.67%.

Proposal for an additional contribution of £177,582 (ex VAT) to ensure the 3G pitch at Skyliner Sports Centre was to a size and standard acceptable to meet FA and local club requirements. This would ensure the pitch was commercially viable and would ultimately contribute to a reduction in management fee.

- (b) FHDC: Newmarket Leisure Centre. Proposal for an immediate allocation of £204,000 (ex VAT) on an 'invest to save' basis for the upgrading of the current gymnasium equipment at Newmarket Leisure Centre, through re-design of the space to increase capacity and investment in upgraded cardiovascular fitness equipment. This, in turn, would guarantee a reduction in management fee of £60,000 per annum from 2017/2018 onwards and represented a return on investment of 29.4%.

A discussion was held on ownership issues, lease agreements and the associated responsibilities, as detailed in paragraph 2.2 of both reports. Members noted that a review of these matters would be undertaken once the proposed leisure partnership agreement with each authority was in place.

The Cabinets acknowledged the benefits of investing in leisure facilities and the contribution to the Councils' strategic priorities in respect of striving for improvements in the general wellbeing, physical and mental health of communities.

Both Cabinets supported approval of the recommendations, (as amended for SEBC) set out in the reports.

On the conclusion of the informal joint discussions at 6.14 pm, the Chairman then formally opened the meeting of Forest Heath District Council's Cabinet at 6.17 pm in the Conference Chamber West.



# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Cabinet** held on  
**Tuesday 1 November 2016 at 6.17 pm** in the **Conference Chamber West,**  
**West Suffolk House,** Western Way, Bury St Edmunds, IP33 3YU

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** Robin Millar

David Bowman  
Andy Drummond

Stephen Edwards

**252. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lance Stanbury and James Waters.

**253. Open Forum**

This item had already been considered during the informal discussions in relation to Item 4. on the agenda (Item 1. above within the notes of the informal discussions refers).

**254. Public Participation**

This item had already been considered during the informal discussions in relation to Item 4. on the agenda (Item 2. above within the notes of the informal discussions refers).

**255. Investing in our Leisure Provision in West Suffolk and Establishing a Long Term Strategic Partnership Approach and Reduced Management Fee with Abbeycroft Leisure (Report No: CAB/FH/16/049)**

Further to the joint informal discussions held prior to the meeting with St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Cabinet on Report No: CAB/FH/16/049, it was proposed, seconded and with the vote being unanimous, it was

**RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL:** (21 December 2016)

That:-

1. The creation of a strategic investment fund of £5m across West Suffolk (£3.5m Forest Heath District Council and £1.5m St Edmundsbury Borough Council) funded from the strategic priorities and Medium Term Financial Strategy Reserve, with delegated authority given to Cabinet (for sums of £500,000 or more) and delegation to the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and

Culture in conjunction with a Director and the Head of Resources and Performance (for sums of less than £500,000) to draw down from this fund, subject to a satisfactory business case for each investment proposal for investment in the Council's leisure facilities.

**RESOLVED:**

That:-

2. The development of a long-term leisure partnership agreement (supported by a business plan) be approved, for consideration at a future Cabinet meeting that must address:
  - The principles of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and Value for Money considerations.
  - The outcomes of the Promoting Physical Activity Framework.
  - The planned utilisation of the investment (established in recommendation 1. above) to achieve the reduction in the management fee payable by the Council to zero.
  - The principles set out in Section 2.1 of Report No CAB/FH/16/049.

Due to the urgency of initial funding requests, the following decision has also been taken:

**RESOLVED:**

That:-

3. An investment of £204,000 (ex VAT) into new equipment for the Newmarket Leisure Centre from the Council's approved capital invest to save fund to deliver a £60,000 per annum management fee saving.

The Meeting concluded at 6.18 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

# Extraordinary Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

**Minutes** of a meeting of the **Extraordinary Cabinet** held on  
**Tuesday 22 November 2016** at **6.30 pm** at the **Council Chamber, District  
Offices**, College Heath Road, Mildenhall IP28 7EY

Present: **Councillors**

**Chairman** James Waters

**Vice Chairman** Robin Millar

David Bowman

Stephen Edwards

Andy Drummond

Lance Stanbury

**In Attendance**

Ruth Bowman

Colin Noble

256. **Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

257. **Open Forum**

No non-Cabinet Members in attendance wished to speak under this item.

258. **Public Participation**

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

259. **Findings of the Extraordinary (Informal Joint) Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 4 October 2016 - What Will Devolution Mean for West Suffolk? (Report No: CAB/FH/16/050)**

Councillor Ruth Bowman presented this item in her capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Forest Heath District Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The report before Cabinet set out the findings of the St Edmundsbury Borough Council and Forest Heath District Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committees following the work jointly undertaken in respect of the topic: 'What will Devolution mean for West Suffolk?'.

As reported at the Council meeting prior to Cabinet, the situation with regard to the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution agreement had significantly changed since publication of the agendas.

Accordingly, an amended recommendation had been tabled to the Cabinet meeting and Councillor Bowman asked that this be acknowledged and noted.

**RESOLVED:**

That the concerns of the St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath Overview and Scrutiny Committees regarding the veto vote of the directly elected Mayor for the then proposed Mayoral Combined Authority for Norfolk and Suffolk, as outlined in Paragraph 1.2 of Report No CAB/FH/16/050, be formally acknowledged and noted, and this will be taken into account in any negotiations regarding the setting up of a Mayoral authority for Devolution during negotiations at a later stage.

260. **Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution Agreement (Report No CAB/FH/16/051)**

As a result of an amended recommendation resolved by Council, immediately prior to Cabinet, in respect of this item there was now no need for Cabinet to undertake a final decision in its Executive capacity in relation to this matter.

The meeting concluded at 6.36 pm

**Signed by:**

**Chairman**

---

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Report of the Extraordinary Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 20 October 2016</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/052</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 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>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07970 947704 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk">lance.stanbury@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>	On 20 October 2016, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held an Extraordinary meeting to consider the following item:  (1) Transport Links for Rural Villages in Forest Heath.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>The Cabinet is requested to <u>NOTE</u> the contents of Report CAB/FH/16/052, being the report of the Extraordinary Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</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"/> <i>(Report for information only)</i>	

<b>Consultation:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<b>Implications:</b>			
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<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)
See Reports listed under background papers below			
<b>Wards affected:</b>		All Wards	
<b>Background papers:</b>		See links in paragraph 1.1.3 of this report to Report No OAS/FH/16/028 and Appendices 1 and 1A.	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation**

### **1.1 Transport Links for Rural Villages in Forest Heath (Report No: OAS/FH/16/028)**

- 1.1.1 The Committee held the second in a series of meetings looking at the disjointed and unpredictable way of public transport connections in Forest Heath, particularly in the case of Red Lodge.
- 1.1.2 For this meeting, the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, in consultation with Councillor Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth 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 Stephensons of Essex).
- 1.1.3 Each of the four providers were also 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 Stephensons 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.
- 1.1.4 The aim of the meeting 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.
- 1.1.5 The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Dean Robbie, Service Delivery Manager from Stephensons of Essex. Dean explained the history of Stephensons of Essex; his role in the company as Service Delivery Manager and previous transport roles held. The aim of Stephensons of Essex was to integrate services where possible. 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 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.
- 1.1.6 The Committee 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.
- 1.1.7 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Growth questioned whether there was 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 Stephensons 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 Stephensons of Essex into Stephensons of Suffolk.

- 1.1.8 The Committee expressed its 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.
- 1.1.9 The Committee also considered other responses received from Abellio Greater Anglia; Coach Services Limited and Mulleys Motorways Limited (Appendix 1 and 1A). Members 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.
- 1.1.10 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).
- 1.1.11 The Committee **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 and Growth regarding future meetings of the Joint Suffolk County Council/West Suffolk Cabinet Member Meeting (Highways and Transport).



# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 10 November 2016</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/053</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 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>	<p>On 10 November 2016, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Annual Presentation by the Portfolio Holder for Operations;</li> <li>(2) Barley Homes – Five Year Business Plan;</li> <li>(3) Car Parking Update;</li> <li>(4) Review and Revision of the Constitution (Quarterly Report);</li> <li>(5) Directed Surveillance Authorised Applications (Quarter 2); and</li> <li>(6) Work Programme Update.</li> </ul> <p>A separate report is included on this Cabinet agenda for Item <b>(2)</b> above.</p>	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>The Cabinet is requested to <u>NOTE</u> the contents of Report CAB/FH/16/053, being the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</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"/> Report for information only.	
<b>Consultation:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<b>Implications:</b>			
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports listed under background papers below</li> </ul>	
<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)
See Reports listed under background papers below			
<b>Wards affected:</b>		All Wards	
<b>Background papers:</b>		Please see background papers, which are listed at the end of the report.	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation**

### **1.1 Annual Presentation by the Portfolio Holder for Operations (Report No: OAS/FH/16/029 and Verbal)**

1.1.1 As set out in the Council's Constitution, at every ordinary Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting at least one Cabinet Member shall be invited to attend to give an account of his or her portfolio and to answer questions from the Committee.

1.1.2 The Committee was reminded that on 12 November 2015, the Committee received a presentation from the Cabinet Member for Operations, setting out responsibilities covered under the planning and growth portfolio.

1.1.3 At this meeting, the portfolio holder for Operations, Councillor David Bowman, had been invited back to provide a follow-up presentation on his portfolio. Report No: OAS/FH/16/029, set out the focus for the follow-up presentation, which was to:

- Outline the main challenges faced since during the first year within your portfolio;
- Outline some key successes and any failures during the first year and any lessons learned:
- Set out the vision for the Operations Portfolio through to 2019 and were you on target to meet that vision.

1.1.4 Members discussed the presentation in detail and asked questions of the Cabinet Member for Operations, to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on costs relating to the West Suffolk Operational Hub and future expansion; and the perceived lack of provision of a household waste recycling facility for Newmarket. It was felt that a town of 19,000 residents deserved better, regardless of the fact that it was surrounded by Cambridgeshire. In response to comments made, the Head of Operations agreed to take the comments back to the Suffolk Waste Partnership.

1.1.5 The Cabinet Member for Operations thanked officers for all the work they were doing and for the Committee's scrutiny of his portfolio.

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

### **1.2 Car Parking Update (Report No: OAS/FH/16/031)**

1.2.1 The Committee received Report No: OAS/FH/16/031, which updated Members on the implementation of the Car Parking Review. The report included information on usage; occupancy; impact of the home of horse racing; pocket car parks; enforcement; road directional signage; new information boards; improvements to Rous Road car park; electric charging points; Park Mark; residential parking zones; Civic Parking Enforcement and financial income.

- 1.2.2 The Committee considered the report in detail and asked a number of questions to which comprehensive responses were provided. In particular discussions were held on progress towards potential Civil Parking Enforcement in Suffolk, and the impact of parking in the near future in relation to the Home of Horseracing and where coaches would park. Detailed discussions were also held on on-street parking enforcement, which was the responsibility of the police authority.
- 1.2.3 The Committee **RECOMMENDS 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.**
- 1.3 **Review and Revision of the Constitution – Quarter 2 (Report No: OAS/FH/16/032)**
- 1.3.1 As set out in the Council’s Constitution, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on a quarterly basis would receive a report from the Monitoring Officer setting out minor amendments made arising from changes to legislation, changes to staffing structures/job descriptions or changes in terminology.
- 1.3.2 Report No: OAS/FH/16/032 set out minor amendments which had been made to the Forest Heath District Council Constitution arising from changes to legislation, changes to staffing structures/ job descriptions or changes in terminology from July to September 2016.
- 1.3.3 All Members of the Council had also been informed of the minor amendments made as part of the ongoing review and revision of the Constitution.
- 1.3.4 There being no decision required, the Committee **noted** the minor amendments undertaken by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.
- 1.4 **Directed Surveillance Authorised Applications (Quarter 2) (Verbal)**
- 1.4.1 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. In June 2010 it was agreed that this requirement should be fulfilled by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 1.4.2 The Committee was advised that in Quarter 2, no such surveillance had been authorised.
- 1.5 **Work Programme Update (Report No: OAS/FH/16/033)**
- 1.5.1 The Committee received and **noted** Report No: OAS/FH/16/033, which provided an update on the current status of the Committee’s Work Programme for 2017.

## **2. Background Papers**

- 2.1.1 [Report No: OAS/FH/16/029](#): Annual Presentation by the Cabinet Member for Operations
- 2.1.2 [Report No: OAS/FH/16/031](#): Car Parking Update
- 2.1.3 [Report No: OAS/FH/16/032](#): Review and Revision of the Constitution – Quarter 2
- 2.1.4 [Report No: OAS/FH/16/033](#): Work Programme Update

This page is intentionally left blank

# Cabinet



Forest Heath  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee: Barley Homes - Five Year Business Plan</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/054</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Sara Mildmay-White West Suffolk Lead Member for Housing <b>Tel:</b> 01284 702212 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk">sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	
<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>	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, Council approved the establishment of a Housing Development Company, limited by shares for the purpose of developing housing for sale, private and affordable rent. In principle approval was given by 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. 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 Business Plan.</p> <p>This report asks the Cabinet to consider the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to the scrutiny of the Barley Homes Five Year Business Plan.</p>	

<b>Recommendations:</b>	<p>It is <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that, subject to the approval of Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The five year Business Plan, attached at Exempt Appendix A to Report No: OAS/FH/16/030, be approved;</li> <li>2) 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, be approved;</li> <li>3) Delegation be given 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 2 above) subject to state aid requirements;</li> <li>4) The S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for 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;</li> <li>5) Approval of the Business Plan will constitute consent for Barley Homes to issue shares and enter into debt financing, in line with the Business Plan, be noted.</li> </ol>
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report OAS/FH/16/030</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report OAS/FH/16/030</li> </ul>
<b>Implications:</b>	
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report OAS/FH/16/030</li> </ul>
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report OAS/FH/16/030</li> </ul>
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report OAS/FH/16/030</li> </ul>
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report OAS/FH/16/030</li> </ul>



<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		• See Report OAS/FH/16/030	
<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)
See Report OAS/FH/16/030			
<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="#">Report No: OAS/FH/16/030</a>  <b>(Note:</b> Members who wish to receive a copy of <b>the Exempt Appendix A - Business Plan</b> , please contact Democratic Services directly).	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations**

- 1.1 On 10 November 2016, the Committee considered Report No: OAS/FH16/030, which asked Members to scrutinise the content of the Barley Homes initial five year Business Plan, prior to being considered by Cabinet and Full Council in December 2016 to approve the funding mechanism required to deliver the plan. Attached as Exempt Appendix A, was the Barley Homes Group Business Plan.
- 1.2 The Committee was reminded that the primary function of Barley Homes was to generate profits 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 was one of the many ways that the council was looking to become self-sufficient through new income generation activities, as central government grants were reduced and eventually removed.
- 1.3 The Report set out key issues, which included initial sites; investment opportunity and financial returns; monitoring of progress and future development decisions; delivery of the business plan; legal implications and the next steps.
- 1.4 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee scrutinised the Exempt Appendix A attached to the report, and as reference was made to specific detail, these discussions were held in private session.
- 1.5 The Committee asked a number of questions to which the two Directors from Barley Homes provided comprehensive responses.
- 1.6 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has put forward recommendations as set out on the front of the Report.

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 24 November 2016</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/055</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 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>Chairman of the Committee:</b>	Louis Busuttil Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee <b>Tel:</b> 01638 810517 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:louis.busuttil@forest-heath.gov..uk">louis.busuttil@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>	<p>On 24 November 2016, the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee held an informal joint meeting with members of St Edmundsbury's Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee, and <u>considered the first four items jointly:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Mid-year Internal Audit Progress Report 2016-2017;</li> <li>(2) Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 2 Performance Report 2016-2017;</li> <li>(3) West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register Quarterly Monitoring Report – September 2016;</li> <li>(4) Work Programme Update;</li> <li>(5) Ernst and Young – Presentation of Annual Audit Letter 2015-2016;</li> </ol>	

	<p>(6) Annual Corporate Environmental Performance 2015-2016;</p> <p>(7) Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) – Quarter 2 (April to September 2016);</p> <p>(8) Delivering a Sustainable Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017-2020;</p> <p>(9) Mid-year Treasury Management Performance Report and Investment Activity (April to September 2016);</p> <p>Separate reports are included on this Cabinet agenda for Items <b>(8)</b> and <b>(9)</b> above.</p>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>The Cabinet is requested to <u>NOTE</u> the contents of Report CAB/FH/16/055, being the report of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee.</b>
<p><b>Key Decision:</b></p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Report for information only.</p>
<b>Consultation:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See reports listed in Section 2 below.</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See reports listed in Section 2 below</li> </ul>
<b>Implications:</b>	
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Please see background papers.
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Please see background papers.
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Please see background papers
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications?</i>	Please see background papers.
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Please see background papers.
<b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b>	Please see background papers.
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	All Wards.
<b>Background papers:</b>	Please see background papers, which are listed at the end of the report.
<b>Documents attached:</b>	None

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation**

### **1.1 Mid-year Internal Audit Progress Report 2016-2017 (Report No: PAS/FH/16/025)**

- 1.1.1 The Committee received and **noted** the report, which advised Members of the work of the Internal Audit Section for the first half of 2016-2017 (Appendix A), including the variety of corporate projects and activities which were supported through the work of the team.
- 1.1.2 The report also included an update on progress made against the 2016-2017 Internal Audit Plan previously approved by the Committee in May 2016.

### **1.2 Balanced Scorecard and Quarter 2 Performance Report 2016-2017 (Report No: PAS/FH/16/026)**

- 1.2.1 The Committee received Report No PAS/FH/16/026, which set out the West Suffolk Balanced Scorecards being used to measure the Council's performance for 2016-2017 and an overview of performance against those indicators for the second quarter of 2016-2017. The six current balanced scorecards (attached at Appendices A to F to Report No: PAS/FH/16/026) were linked to the Heads of Service areas, which presented Quarter 2 2016-2017 performance.
- 1.2.2 Most indicators reported performance against an agreed target using a traffic light system with additional commentary provided for performance indicators below optimum performance.
- 1.2.3 In quarter 1, the performance against the "% telephone calls answered" indicators was below target levels across all areas. During quarter 2, the performance against these indicators had increased and was now getting back towards the levels seen during the 2015-2016 financial year, despite call volumes still being higher than comparable periods last financial year.
- 1.2.4 There had been a slight drop corporately in the performance against the indicator "% of non-disputed invoices paid within 30 days" since quarter 1. The figure in June 2016 was 93.17%, whereas in September 2016 the figure was 87.63%. The finance and performance team would continue to work with the service areas to try and improve performance against this indicator, with monthly business intelligence reports being sent out with details of all invoices processed.
- 1.2.5 Another area where performance had dipped slightly since the quarter 1 this year was in homelessness. An increase in homeless cases of 30% from the first quarter had led to a slightly increased time taken to make homelessness decisions and an increased use of B&B accommodation in quarter 2.
- 1.2.6 Discussions were held on the increase in homelessness cases presented.
- 1.2.7 No issues were required to be brought to the attention of Cabinet.

- 1.3 **West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register Quarterly Monitoring Report – September 2016 (Report No: PAS/FH/16/027)**
- 1.3.1 The Committee received and **noted** the second quarterly risk register monitoring report in respect of the West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register. The Register was updated regularly by the Risk Management Group and at its recent meeting the Group reviewed the target risk, the risk level where the Council aimed to be, and agreed a current risk assessment. These assessments formed the revised West Suffolk Risk Register (Appendix 1). Some individual controls and actions had been updated and those which were not ongoing and had been completed by September 2016 had been removed from the Register.
- 1.3.2 There had been no amendments to current risks or any new risks added, and no existing risks had been closed since the Strategic Risk Register was last report to the Committee.
- 1.3.3 Members considered the report and in particular discussed risk WS4 – staff retention.
- 1.4 **Work Programme Update (Report No: PAS/FH/16/028)**
- 1.4.1 The Committee received and **noted** its Work Programme which provided items scheduled to be presented to the Committee during 2017.
- 1.5 **Ernst and Young – Presentation of Annual Audit Letter (2015-2016) Report No: PAS/FH/16/029)**
- 1.5.1 The Committee received and **noted** this report which updated Members on the outcome of the annual audit of the 2015-2016 financial statements by Ernst and Young as detailed in their Annual Audit Letter for 2015-2016, attached as Appendix 1 to Report No: PAS/FH/16/029. The letter was for information and confirmed the completion of the audit of the 2015-2016 financial statements.
- 1.5.2 It was reported that the planned audit fee for the year remained unchanged (£47,059), other than a small additional fee which related to some work on the Council’s proposed Medium Revenue Provision policy. This work had been requested by management and the fee of £1,431 had been agreed by the S151 Officer.
- 1.5.3 Work on the certification of claims and returns had not yet commenced and the results of this work, along with the final fee, would be reported in the Annual Certification Report.
- 1.6 **Annual Corporate Environmental Performance 2015-2016 (Report No: PAS/FH/16/030)**
- 1.6.1 The Committee received and **noted** Report No: PAS/FH/16/030, which set out the Annual Environmental Statement covering environmental performance in 2015-2016 (Appendix A). The Statement covered the operations of both Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council and the leisure trusts in West Suffolk in respect of energy and water consumption and

renewable energy regeneration.

1.6.2 The Committee were particularly referred to paragraph 1.2.1 of the report which explained that the Councils continued to work to improve environmental performance during the year and also summarised the areas of key interest. Paragraph 1.2.2 of the report also summarised the community-focused environmental work.

1.6.3 The Committee scrutinised the West Suffolk Environmental Statement 2015-2016, and asked a number of questions to which Officers duly responded. In particular, Members raised concerns in relation to the air quality levels in Brandon and how these had been affected since the duelling of the A11.

## 1.7 **Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) 2016-2017 – Quarter 2 (April to September 2016) (Report No: PAS/FH/16/031)**

1.7.1 The Committee received and **noted** Report No: PAS/FH/16/031, which set out the financial performance for the second quarter of 2016-2017 and forecasted outturn position for 2016-2017.

1.7.2 Attached at Appendix A and B to the report was details of the Council's revenue performance and year end forecasted outturn position. Explanations of the main year end forecast over/(under) spends was set out within paragraph 1.2.3 of the report. Appendix C to the report set out the Council's capital financial position for the first six months of 2016-2017, which showed expenditure of £18,237,861. Finally, a summary of earmarked reserves was attached at Appendix D, along with the forecast year end position for 2016-2017.

1.7.3 The Resources and Performance Team would continue to work with Budget Holders to monitor capital spend and project progress closely for the remainder of the financial year and an updated position would be presented to the Committee on a quarter basis.

1.7.3 The Committee scrutinised the report and asked questions to which Officers duly responded.

## 2. **Background Papers**

2.1.1 [Report No: PAS/FH/16/025](#); [Appendix A](#): Mid-Year Internal Audit Progress Report 2016-2017

2.1.2 [Report No: PAS/FH/16/026](#); [Appendix A \(Resources and Performance\)](#); [Appendix B \(Families and Communities\)](#); [Appendix C \(HR, Legal and Democratic Services\)](#); [Appendix D \(Planning and Growth\)](#); [Appendix E \(Operations\)](#); [Appendix F \(Housing\)](#): Balanced Scorecards and Quarter 2 Performance Report 2016-2017

2.1.3 [Report No: PAS/FH/16/027](#); [Appendix 1](#): West Suffolk Strategic Risk Register Quarterly Monitoring Report – September 2016

2.1.4 [Report No: PAS/FH/16/028](#): Work Programme Update

- 2.1.5 [Report No: PAS/FH/16/029](#); [Appendix 1](#): Ernst and Young – Presentation of Annual Audit Letter (2015-2016)
- 2.1.6 [Report No: PAS/FH/16/030](#); [Appendix A](#): Annual Corporate Environmental Performance 2015-2016
- 2.1.7 [Report No PAS/FH/16/031](#); [Appendix A](#); [Appendix B](#); [Appendix C](#); [Appendix D](#): Financial Performance Report (Revenue and Capital) 2016-2017 Quarter 2 – (April to September 2016)



# Cabinet



Forest Heath

District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 24 November 2016 – Delivering a Sustainable Budget Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017-2020</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/056</b>	
<b>Reports to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 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>Chairman of the Committee:</b>	Louis Busuttil Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee <b>Tel:</b> 01638 810517 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:louis.busuttil@forest-heath.gov.uk">louis.busuttil@forest-heath.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>	On 24 November 2016, the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee considered Report No: <b>PAS/FH/16/032</b> , which updated Members on progress made towards delivering a balanced budget for 2017-2018 and sustainable budget in the medium term, and to recommend to Cabinet inclusion of the proposals in the report to progress securing a balanced budget for 2017-2018 and sustainable budget in the medium term.	

<b>Recommendation:</b>		<b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that:</b>	
		<p>1) The proposals, as detailed in Section 5 and Table 2 at paragraph 5.1 of Report No: PAS/FH/16/032, be included, in securing a balanced budget for 2017-2018.</p> <p>2) The items as detailed in paragraph 5.3 of Report No: PAS/FH/16/032 are treated as pending budgets that will require the necessary approvals before they can be committed.</p> <p>3) The items as detailed in paragraph 5.5 and Table 3 of Report No: PAS/FH/16/032 be removed from the capital programme.</p> <p>4) The reserve transfers as detailed in paragraph 5.7 and Table 4 of Report No: PAS/FH/16/032, be approved.</p>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>		<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i>	
<i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i>		Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (As it is a full Council decision)	
<b>Consultation:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<b>Implications:</b>			
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</li> </ul>	
<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)
See Report No: PAS/FH/16/032			
<b>Wards affected:</b>		All Wards	

<p><b>Background papers:</b>  <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i></p>	<p><b>Cabinet: 1 September 2015</b>  <a href="#">CAB/FH/15/038</a> – West Suffolk Strategic Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020.</p> <p><b>Council: 24 February 2016</b>  <a href="#">COU/FH/16/004</a> Budget and Council Tax Setting 2016/17</p> <p><b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 15 September 2016</b>  <a href="#">OAS/FH/16/022</a> Report - Approach to delivering a sustainable medium term financial strategy 2016 - 2020 and consideration of the four year settlement offer from central</p> <p><b>Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 24 November 2016</b>  <a href="#">Report No: PAS/FH/16/032</a> and <a href="#">Appendix A</a></p>
<p><b>Documents attached:</b></p>	<p>None</p>

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation**

### **1.1 Future budget pressure and challenges**

- 1.1.1 Forest Heath District Council continues to face considerable financial challenges as a result of increased cost and demand pressures and constraints on public sector spending.
- 1.1.2 The Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016-2020, approved by Council on 24 February 2016 (Report: COU/FH/16/004 refers) sets out the current and future financial pressures and challenges facing Forest Heath.
- 1.1.3 The budget gap for years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020 were projected in Table 1 of the report. The current budget assumptions for 2017-2018 to 2019-2020 and for the period of the Medium Term Financial Strategy were detailed in Appendix A.
- 1.1.4 The report "*West Suffolk Operational Hub*" (Report No: CAB/FH/16/023 refers), approved by Council on 29 June 2016, sought approval for the allocation of capital project funding. The ongoing revenue implications in respect of this project had been included in the budget gap figures.
- 1.1.5 The report "*Approach to Delivering a Sustainable Medium Term Financial Strategy 2016*" (Report No: CAB/FH/16/041 refers), approved by Council on 28 September 2016, included a number of funding requests in respect of Economic Development and growth funding. These had also been taken account of in the budget gap figures.
- 1.1.6 Report No: PAS/FH/16/032 provided the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee with information on the future budget pressures and challenges; budget gap and budget assumptions; methodology for securing a balanced budget 2017/2020; budget proposals for 2017-2020; pending project proposals and capital programme 2017-2020; business rates revaluation and proposed budget timetable.
- 1.1.7 **Extract from Report No: PAS/FH/16/032**

### **5. Budget proposals for 2017-2020**

*5.1 The Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee is asked to support and recommend to Cabinet the **inclusion of the following proposals**, as detailed in **Table 2** below, in order to progress securing a balanced budget for 2017-2018.*

**Table 2: Budget proposals for 2017/2020**

	<b>2017/18 Pressure/ (Saving) £000</b>	<b>2018/19 Pressure/ (Saving) £000</b>	<b>2019/20 Pressure/ (Saving) £000</b>
<b>Budget Gap</b>	<b>949</b>	<b>1,356</b>	<b>1,580</b>
<b>Current proposals:</b>			
<b>Income Assumptions:</b>			
Business Rates Income - revised figures based on latest ARP data	(95)	(166)	(197)
Local Land Charges Income, budget reinstated following removal from MTFS due to legislative changes	(111)	(111)	(111)
Car Park Income: volume increases based on current levels allowing for increased demand	(14)	(20)	(26)
Trade Waste Income: Revise budget assumption based on historical actuals	15	40	66
Service Level Agreements - additional income mainly from ACAS	(43)	(43)	(43)
Current Property Portfolio income assumption changes, following initial income review	(61)	(111)	(41)
Investment Income revisions resulting from interest rate reductions and capital programme changes	110	101	228
Planning & Building Regulation Fees - revised based on current levels	(43)	(58)	(71)
Community Energy Plan revised budget assumptions based on current levels	6	(22)	(22)
Council tax income - revised figures based on updated taxbase	28	86	146
<b>Expenditure Assumptions:</b>			
Waste Tipping Charges - increased gate fees	29	29	29
Leisure Management Fee Reductions as approved by Cabinet	(60)	(60)	(60)
Housing Benefit - rephasing of budget to achieve cost neutral position by 2020/21 in line with universal credit	0	50	100
<b>Projects:</b>			
Solar Farm Project projections (net position)	(283)	(350)	(385)
Continuation of the Small Business Support Grants Scheme	20	20	20
<b>Other:</b>			
Use of Strategic Priorities & MTFS Reserve to fund Locality Budgets and Community Chest	(163)	(163)	(163)
Other Budget Assumptions, pressures, income and contracts	(18)	(54)	(45)
<b>Remaining Budget Gap *</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>1,005</b>

\* The budget gap as reported in the table above is still subject to ongoing work as part of the budget setting process, and an updated position will be presented to this committee at its January meeting.

5.2 The introduction of the Garden Waste Collection Service in April has proved to be relatively successful. New processing contracts are working well, levels of participation are broadly as we had anticipated and supporting technology has been adopted within the operations teams. However, it is still early days and the full impact of this change in terms of waste collection and disposal are still to be fully understood. We will be reviewing data over the medium term to test the budget assumptions at county level and within our own MTFS. Members will recall that the financial arrangements that underpin these changes have been fixed for up to three years to provide sufficient time to fully understand the full impact of this change.

### **Pending Project Proposals and Capital Programme 2017-2020**

5.3 The projects and review of capital programme work package has identified that Forest Heath have a number of projects in the pipeline, such as the Leisure Partnership Agreement and Housing Company projects, where full Business Cases have not yet been approved. Both the Leisure Partnership Agreement and Housing Company projects have business cases planned to be considered at December Council, at which point the capital and revenue returns will be included in the budgets going forward and the budget gap currently shown in table 1 above will be revised.

5.4 However, in order to plan over the medium term, provision should be also be made in the revenue and capital budget projections for those projects we are aware of but are yet to approve. The January committee report will therefore propose to add these as pending budgets which will require the necessary approvals before they can be committed.

5.5 A review of the capital programme has identified that there were some projects that required no further capital allocation. It is therefore proposed that the following projects are removed from the capital programme:

**Table 3: Capital programme – projects to be removed**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>2016/17 Residual Budget £000s</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Enterprise Hub/Innovation Park	1,450	Moved from short to medium term strategic priority list
Housing Strategy	150	Delivered through detailed projects and actions
Feasibility Studies	100	Move to Revenue, continued to be funded from the MTFS and Strategic Priorities Reserve

5.6 The project support, skills and capacity work package review identified some skills and capacity challenges in supporting our exciting, but complex, range of services and growth projects, both for in terms of current and future projects. The leadership team is therefore working to increase capacity and skills where it is needed and will seek to do so within the overall salary budget. It's critical that we ensure the right capacity and skills are in place to go beyond the 'planning' and into the 'delivery' phase in order to achieve the financial expectations in our Medium Term Financial Strategy and to deliver our sustainable, self-sufficient future.

5.7 As a result of the MTFs review, the following transfers between earmarked reserves have been proposed:

**Table 4: Earmarked reserves – proposed transfers**

Reserve Name	2016/17 Forecast Closing Balance £	Adjustment Proposed £	New balance £	Notes
ARP	311,789	(100,000)	<b>211,789</b>	To HB Equalisation
HB Equalisation	161,321	100,000	<b>261,321</b>	From ARP
Building Maintenance - Leisure	0	27,932	<b>27,932</b>	From Leisure
Leisure	27,932	(27,932)	<b>0</b>	To Building Maintenance - Leisure
Building Maintenance - Other	0	56,170	<b>56,170</b>	From Car Park Development
Car Park Development	56,170	(56,170)	<b>0</b>	To Building Maintenance - Other
Invest to Save	221,027	83,061	<b>304,088</b>	From reserves below
Local Land Charges	50,142	(50,142)	<b>0</b>	To Invest to Save
Staff Training	22,582	(22,582)	<b>0</b>	To Invest to Save
Planning Policy Statement Climate Change	2,579	(2,579)	<b>0</b>	To Invest to Save
Implementing Smoke Free Legislation	7,758	(7,758)	<b>0</b>	To Invest to Save
	<b>861,300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>861,300</b>	

1.1.5 The Committee was further asked to consider that:

- 1) the items, as detailed in paragraph 5.3 (above) are treated as pending budgets that will require the necessary approvals before they can be committed.
- 2) the items as detailed in paragraph 5.5 (above) be removed from the capital programme; and
- 3) the reserve transfers as detailed in paragraph 5.7 (above) be approved.

1.2 **Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee**

- 1.2.1 The Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee scrutinised the report in detail and **noted** the budget assumptions outlined in Appendix A) and the budget timetable along with progress made to date on delivering a balanced budget for 2017-2018 and sustainable budget in the medium term.
- 1.2.2 The Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee has put forward recommendations as set out on page 2 of this report.



# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Recommendation of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee: 24 November 2016 – Mid-Year Treasury Management Performance Report and Investment Activity (April – September 2016)</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/057</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 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>Chairman of the Committee:</b>	Louis Busuttil Chairman of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee <b>Tel:</b> 01638 810517 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:louis.busuttil@forest-heath.gov.uk">louis.busuttil@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead Officers:</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>	On 24 November 2016, the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee received Report No: <b>PAS/FH/16/033</b> which presented the Council's Mid-Year Treasury Management Report summarising the investment activity for the period 1 April to 30 September 2016.	

<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that, subject to the approval of Council, the Mid-Year Treasury Management Report 2016-2017, attached at Appendix 1 to Report No: PAS/FH/16/033, be approved.</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"/> <i>(As it is a Council decision)</i>		
<b>Consultation:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<b>Implications:</b>			
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033</li> </ul>		
<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)
See Report No: PAS/FH/16/033			
<b>Wards affected:</b>	All Wards		
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	Annual Treasury Management and Investment Strategy 2016-2017 ( <a href="#">Report No PAS/FH/16/033</a> ; <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> )		
<b>Documents attached:</b>	None		

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendation**

### **1.1 Mid-Year Treasury Report 2016-2017 and Investment Activity (April to September 2016)**

- 1.1.1 The Committee received Report No: PAS/FH/16/033, which provided a summary of investment activities for the first six months of 2016-2017. Full details of treasury management activities during the period attached at Appendix 1 to the report. It was reported as at 30 September 2016, the Council held £18,425,000 of investments.
- 1.1.2 Explanations were provided on the under-achievement of interest earned during the period, which was mainly due to the reduction in funds available for investment following the purchase of the Toggam Solar Farm.
- 1.1.3 Explanations were also provided on the reduced average rate of return during the period, which was due to the reduction in the Bank of England base rate and the resulting reduction of interest rates offered by institutions.
- 1.1.4 The Committee scrutinised the Mid-Year Treasury Report 2016-2017, and asked questions of Officers to which responses were provided.
- 1.1.5 The Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee has put forward recommendations as set out on page two of this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee 11 October 2016: Training for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Drivers</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/058</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Councillor Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07970 947704 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk">lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Chairman of the Committee:</b>	Councillor Michael Anderson Licensing and Regulatory Committee <b>Tel:</b> 01638 601624 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:michael.anderson@forest-heath.gov.uk">michael.anderson@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead Officer:</b>	Peter Gudde Service Manager Environmental Health <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757042 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:peter.gudde@westsuffolk.gov.uk">peter.gudde@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	<p>On 10 October 2016 the Licensing and Regulatory Committee considered the following substantive items of business:</p> <p>(1) Forest Heath Local Air Quality Strategy: Progress Report 201-2016; and</p> <p>(2) Training for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Drivers.</p> <p>Recommendations emanated from consideration of Item <b>(2)</b> above (Report No: LIC/FH/16/006 refers). This report presented the results of public consultation on whether a requirement for Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Vehicle Drivers to obtain a Business and Technology Education Council (BTEC)</p>	

	<p>Level 2 Qualification should be implemented. As the proposal would be a change of policy final approval of it would be by full Council on the recommendations of Cabinet.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p>	<p><b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that, subject to the approval of Council, the results of the recent consultation with Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Vehicle Drivers and taxi customers on the proposal to adopt a BTEC Level 2 Certificate 'Introduction to the role of Professional Taxi and Private Hire Driver', as detailed in Report No: LIC/FH/16/006, be noted and;</b></p> <p><b>(1) The change in requirements for all new drivers to complete the BTEC Level 2 Certificate be approved;</b></p> <p><b>(2) The change in the requirements for all current drivers to complete the BTEC Level 2 Certificate within two years be approved;</b></p> <p>Officers further <b><u>RECOMMEND</u></b> that, subject to the <b>approval of Council:</b></p> <p><b>(3) (a) Instead of the above-mentioned requirements for achieving the BTEC 2 Certificate, existing drivers be required to attend half-day training covering specific issues of concern including safeguarding vulnerable people, assisting customers with disabilities and customer care provided at no cost to attendees; and</b></p> <p><b>(b) the Disciplinary Code for Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Vehicles be amended to reflect that should existing drivers fail to comply with (4)(a) above, this would constitute a contravention of this Code, and as a consequence, he/she will be required to obtain the full BTEC Level 2 Certificate referred to in (2) above.</b></p>
<p><b>Key Decision:</b></p>	<p><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"/></p>

<b>Consultation:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</li> </ul>		
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See paragraph 1.2.2 below</li> </ul>		
<b>Implications:</b>			
Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</li> </ul>	
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</li> </ul>	
Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</li> </ul>	
Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</li> </ul>	
Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</li> </ul>	
<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)
See Report No: LIC/FH/16/006			
<b>Wards affected:</b>		All Wards	
<b>Background papers:</b>		<a href="#">Report No: LIC/FH/16/006</a> ; <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> ; <a href="#">Appendix 2</a> ; <a href="#">Appendix 3</a> ; <a href="#">Appendix 4</a>	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## **1. Key issues and reasons for recommendations**

### **1.1 Key Issues**

- 1.1.1 The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 places a duty upon the Council as the Licensing Authority to ensure that an applicant for a driver's licence was a 'fit and proper person' to hold such a licence and that existing drivers acted in a way as to satisfy the Council that they continued to be 'fit and proper' to hold a licence. Listed in Paragraph 1.4 of Report No: LIC/FH/16/006 were the existing requirements of the Council's 'fit and proper' test. Whilst there were many extremely competent and professional drivers in West Suffolk there was statistical and anecdotal evidence to support the need for improved standards and knowledge. The Department of Transport in a publication '*Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing: Best Practice Guidance*' March 2010 had endorsed the introduction of qualifications in licensing authority regimes. Appendix 1 of the report listed other local authorities nationally that had introduced a requirement for formally recognised qualifications or in house tests as a prerequisite to the grant of a licence. When considering this matter at its meeting on 23 May 2016 the Committee had accepted that the appropriate form for the qualification would be based on BTEC Level 2. The proposed syllabus for this qualification was contained as Appendix 2.
- 1.1.2 External consultation with the taxi trade and the general public, as users, had been carried out on the proposal over July and August 2016. 26 out of a potential 600 registered drivers across West Suffolk and 78 members of the public completed respective surveys. A summary of the responses was included as Appendix 3.
- 1.1.3 The same report was considered by St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Licensing and Regulatory Committee at their meeting on 11 October 2016.

### **1.2 Consideration of the proposal**

- 1.2.1 The Committee was advised that the fee for the course, which would be provided by the West Suffolk College, was £250 after discount and payable to the college. The time involved in attending the course would be 18 hours and this could be tailored so as to be at different times and locations to accommodate the needs of attendees. An alternative condensed training package could be offered over a half day at a discounted price of £35. This would deal with the salient points of each of the modules and those attending who met the required standard of knowledge would receive a certificate. To offset the situation that the Driver/Vehicle Standards Agency had decided to withdraw its practical driving test, an alternative had been negotiated with the West Suffolk College whereby a driving test would be available alongside the BTEC course at a separate fee of £40. This compared to around £90 charged by other commercial providers.
- 1.2.2 In discussing the proposal Members supported the proposal for both new applicants and existing drivers to obtain the qualification.



- 1.2.3 However, following the conclusion of both Authorities' meetings, and taking into account some of the views that were expressed by Members in relation to the requirement for existing drivers to undertake the qualification, Officers conducted further research and are proposing further recommendations provided in (3)(a) and (b) on page 2 of this report for additional consideration to those proposed by the Committee.
- 1.2.4 Officers have confirmed that the half day course referred to in the additional Officer recommendation would cover safeguarding of vulnerable people, customer care and assisting customers with disabilities. Given the specific responses that your Officers have received from local safeguarding bodies, such training is becoming essential to meet their needs. This course could be offered at no cost to participants thus addressing the principal concern of existing taxis drivers of cost.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Local Plan Working Group - 28 November 2016: Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR), Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission Documents and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/059</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 2016 <i>(for Recommendations (2) and (3) only)</i>
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07970 947704 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk">lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Chairman of the Working Group:</b>	Rona Burt Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group <b>Tel:</b> 01638 712309 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:rona.burt@forest-heath.gov.uk">rona.burt@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Marie Smith Strategic Planning Manager <b>Tel:</b> 01638 719260 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:marie.smith@westsuffolk.gov.uk">marie.smith@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	On 28 November 2016, the Local Plan Working Group considered the following substantive items of business:  (1) Responses to consultation and engagement on the Preferred Option Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR), Preferred Options Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/011).	

	<p>(2) Core Strategy Single Issue Review (CS SIR) Submission Document (Regulation 19) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/012).</p> <p>(3) Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission Document (Regulation 19) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/013).</p>
<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p>	<p><b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that:</b></p> <p>(1) <b><u>Responses to consultation and engagement on the Preferred Option Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR), Preferred Options Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/011)</u></b></p> <p><b>That:-</b></p> <p>(a) <b>The responses, comments and actions as set out in Working Paper 1 (Core Strategy Policy CS7 Single Issue Review), Working Paper 2 (Site Allocations Local Plan Preferred Options) and Working Paper 3 (Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan) to Report No: LOP/FH/16/011 be endorsed, subject to the following amendment to Working Paper 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Representations 24341 (page 66) and 24342 (page 69) (The Trustees of the E G Lambton 1974 Settlement) (Site N/18 George Lambton Playing Fields)</u></b></li> </ul> <p><b>The following sentence be deleted under the 'Council's Assessment':</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>"In addition, as located off Fordham Road, development of this large site is likely to raise similar concerns to those recently upheld by the SoS for the development of Hatchfield Farm."</i></b></p> <p>(b) <b>The Head of Planning and Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group, be authorised to make any minor typographical, factual, spelling and grammatical changes to the Officer</b></p>

responses.

**(2) Core Strategy Single Issue Review (CS SIR) Submission Document (Regulation 19) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/012)**

**That, subject to the approval of Council:-**

- (a) The Core Strategy Single Issue Review (CS SIR) Submission document (Regulation 19), as set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/012, be endorsed.**
- (b) The Core Strategy Single Issue Review (CS SIR) Submission document (as set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/012) and accompanying Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)/Sustainability Appraisal (SA), together with supporting documents, be approved for Regulation 19 consultation.**
- (c) The Head of Planning and Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group, be given delegated authority to submit the Core Strategy Submission document, all representations received to it during the final consultation and supporting documents, to the Secretary of State for independent Examination, subject to there being no material issues raised by consultees at the final consultation stage which require further consideration/modifications to the CS SIR.**
- (d) The Head of Planning and Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group, be authorised to make any minor typographical, factual, spelling and grammatical changes to the document, provided that it does not materially affect the substance or meaning.**

	<p><b>(3) <u>Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission Document (Regulation 19) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/013)</u></b></p> <p><b>That, subject to the approval of Council:-</b></p> <p><b>(a) The Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission document (Regulation 19) as set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/013, be endorsed.</b></p> <p><b>(b) The Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission document (as set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/013) and accompanying SEA/SA, together with supporting documents, be approved for Regulation 19 consultation.</b></p> <p><b>(c) The Head of Planning and Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group, be given delegated authority to submit the Site Allocations Local Plan Submission document, all representations received to it during the final consultation and supporting documents, to the Secretary of State for independent Examination, subject to there being no material issues raised by consultees at the final consultation stage which require further consideration/modifications to the SALP.</b></p> <p><b>(d) The Head of Planning and Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth and the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group, be authorised to make any minor typographical, factual, spelling and grammatical changes to the document, provided that it does not materially affect the substance or meaning.</b></p>
<p><b>Key Decision:</b></p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

<i>The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within <b>48 hours</b> and cannot be actioned until <b>five clear working days of the publication of the decision</b> have elapsed. This item is included on the Decisions Plan.</i>			
<b>Consultation:</b>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<b>Implications:</b>			
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013	
<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)
See Reports: LOP/FH/16/011, 012 and 013			
<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>		<u>Local Plan Working Group:</u> 28 November 2016 <a href="#">Report No: LOP/FH/16/011</a> & <a href="#">Working Paper 1</a> & <a href="#">Working Paper 2</a> & <a href="#">Working Paper 3</a>  <a href="#">Report No: LOP/FH/16/012</a> & <a href="#">Working Paper 1</a>  <a href="#">Report No: LOP/FH/16/013</a> & <a href="#">Working Paper 1</a> & <a href="#">Working Paper 2</a>	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

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

### 1. **Responses to consultation and engagement on the Preferred Option Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR), Preferred Options Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/011)**

- 1.1. The Core Strategy Single Issue Review (CS SIR) revisits the quashed parts of the 2010 Core Strategy as well as reassessing overall housing need/numbers to ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). An 'Issues and Options' (Regulation 18) consultation was completed on the CS SIR in July to September 2012, with a second Issues and Options (Regulation 18) consultation taking place between August and October 2015. A Preferred Option consultation was completed between April and July 2016 (Regulation 18).
- 1.2 An Issues and Options draft of the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) was prepared but did not proceed to consultation in 2013. A further Issues and Options (Regulation 18) draft was completed, and consultation took place concurrently with the SIR between August and October 2015 and again between April and July 2016 (Regulation 18).
- 1.3 A second draft of an Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) was prepared to accompany the Preferred Option(s) consultation drafts of both the CS SIR, and the SALP. The IDP will be updated and refined as the Local Plan documents progress through the planning process (to the Submission draft stage). Consultation took place on this second draft of the IDP concurrently with the Regulation 18 consultations on the SIR and SALP between April and July 2016.
- 1.4 Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises:

*"Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made."*

The accompanying guidance in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) notes that "Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, which should explain how they will engage local communities and other interested parties in producing their Local Plan and determining planning applications."

- 1.5 The Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was adopted in February 2014. The SCI contains a statement of intent to engage with our communities – part of a wider commitment made by the councils to create and maintain effective working relationships with all sectors of the community. The document sets out the key stages in preparing a local plan document, and the protocols that all local authorities must follow. The SCI states the councils' intention to go well beyond the minimum requirements for consultation. The 'Issues and Options' stage concludes, "we must take into



account any representations made to us at this 'Issues and Options' stage."

- 1.6 Responses to all three documents have been received from statutory consultees, such as the Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England etc., town and parish councils, interest groups and individual residents and landowners.
- 1.7 There were a total of 152 representations (of support, objection or comments) from 51 respondents to the Core Strategy Single Issue Review Preferred Options document; 418 representations on the Site Allocations Local Plan Preferred Options document from 87 respondents; 20 representations on the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan from 7 respondents.
- 1.8 Working Papers 1, 2 and 3 of Report No: LOP/FH/16/011 set out summaries of all of the responses received, together with Officer responses and comments and/or actions on each.
- 1.9 Consultation responses to the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment will be considered by the Council's Consultants preparing these documents and will be addressed as part of the next iteration of each of these documents.
- 1.10 The final Submission documents will be taken for approval for consultation and submission to Cabinet on 13 December 2016 and Council on 21 December 2016. As the design and printing of the documents will take a further few weeks, following the Council meeting, the consultation is planned to take place from 10 January 2017 to 21 February 2017.
- 1.11 Comments received during this final consultation will be submitted directly to the Secretary of State with the Local Plan documents for consideration through a Local Plan Examination. It is anticipated that submission of these documents will take place in early March 2017. However, should any factors arise which could cause delay and which are beyond the Council's control, a further meeting of the Working Group will be arranged to outline options for the progressing of the Single Issue Review and any consequential impact on the Local Plan timetable itself.

#### Comments from the Local Plan Working Group

- 1.12 The Working Group considered the responses, comments and actions as set out in Working Paper 1 (Core Strategy Policy CS7 Single Issue Review), Working Paper 2 (Site Allocations Local Plan Preferred Options) and Working Paper 3 (Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan) and recommended that these be endorsed, subject to the following amendment to Working Paper 2:
  - Representations 24341 (page 66) and 24342 (page 69) (The Trustees of the E G Lambton 1974 Settlement) (Site N/18 George Lambton Playing Fields)

The following sentence be deleted under the Council's Assessment:

*"In addition, as located off Fordham Road, development of this large site is likely to raise similar concerns to those recently upheld by the SoS for*

*the development of Hatchfield Farm.”*

2. **Core Strategy Single Issue Review (SIR) Submission Document (Regulation 19) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/012)**
- 2.1 The Core Strategy Single Issue Review (CS SIR) revisits the quashed parts of the 2010 Core Strategy as well as reassessing overall housing need/numbers to ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 2.2 An 'Issues and Options' (Regulation 18) consultation was completed on the CS SIR in July to September 2012, with a second Issues and Options (Regulation 18) consultation taking place between August and October 2015. A Preferred Option consultation was completed between April and July 2016 (Regulation 18). A final Submission consultation (Regulation 19) is scheduled to take place between 10 January 2017 and 21 February 2017 and the Submission draft of the CS SIR, was attached as Working Paper 1 to Report No LOP/FH/16/012.
- 2.3 Since the 2015 Issues and Options and the 2016 Preferred Options consultations on the CS SIR, Officers have been preparing the final Submission version of the document. This is last stage of consultation prior to the document, together with the supporting information and evidence and representations received, being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in Public.
- 2.4 The SIR Submission draft has been reviewed by the Planning Advisory Service and an external expert planning solicitor who have provided feedback and provides the Council confidence that the documents prepared are robust to minimise risk of a successful challenge. The Council's Communications Team have also read and commented upon documents.
- 2.5 Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/012 is the final 'Submission' (Regulation 19) CS SIR consultation document. This statutory Local Plan document confirms the District's overall housing need over the period 2011 – 2031 and how that housing need is distributed among the settlements.
- 2.6 Following on from the consultation on the CS SIR Preferred Options, the Working Group were provided with:
- A summary of the responses which had been made by the key statutory consultees and the key issues which had also been raised by other parties.
  - Supporting text and Policy CS7 changes which had been made to the Submission draft, along with the reasons for the changes.
- 2.7 The Working Group also referred to page 37 of the agenda papers which set out the overall housing provision and distribution for the period 2011 to 2031. Up to end of March 2016, 2437 dwellings have been committed or completed, which left a need to provide 4440 dwellings for the remainder of the Plan period. The shortfall, as a result of the Hatchfield Farm decision, has been met through commitments arising since March 2016 and through increasing capacity on some sites consulted on at the Preferred Options stage.
- 2.8 Policy CS7 distribution is used as a basis for allocating sites in the Site Allocations Local Plan Submission document (Regulation 19). This distribution

provides certainty for the remainder of the Plan period and protects the District from unplanned growth. 6,800 new dwellings and associated infrastructure will be delivered in the period 2011 to 2031.

- 2.9 Environmental designations around Brandon will be protected from negative effects of development. The allocations in Brandon are limited to protect the environmental assets and designations. There is opportunity for growth to the west of Mildenhall for planned mixed use development. Fewer homes are distributed to Newmarket as a result of the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission at Hatchfield Farm for 400 homes and the site is not considered deliverable. The high levels of growth in Red Lodge and Lakenheath in the Plan period will be delivered with the appropriate infrastructure. The primary villages are protected from further unplanned growth.
- 2.10 The final Regulation 19 consultation on this document will be focused on the whether the CS SIR is a 'legally compliant' and 'sound' document. The consultation will ask the public and stakeholders specific questions required by the Planning Inspectorate and requires that representations consider whether the tests of soundness have been met, as set out in the introduction to the document in Working Paper 1 to Report No LOP/FH/16/012.
- 2.11 Consultants have also been appointed to under the full Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) work in relation to the final Submission draft of the CS SIR document. A full report setting out these findings will accompany the document for consultation in January 2017.
- 2.12 The final Submission (Regulation 19) CS SIR document will be considered by Cabinet on 13 December 2016 and Council on 21 December 2016 for approval for consultation and submission to the Secretary of State. A final consultation is planned from 10 January 2017 to 21 February 2017. Consultation events will be held in towns and in Lakenheath and Red Lodge and will be advertised online and in the press. Comments received during this next consultation will be submitted directly to the Secretary of State with the Local Plan documents for consideration through a Local Plan Examination led by an independent Planning Inspector.
- 2.13 It is anticipated that submission of these documents will take place in early March 2017. However, should any factors arise which could cause delay and which are beyond the Council's control, a further meeting of the Working Group will be arranged to outline options for the progressing of the Single Issue Review and any consequential impact on the Local Plan timetable itself.

#### Comments from the Local Plan Working Group

- 2.14 The Working Group considered the Submission draft of the Core Strategy Single Issue Review Submission document, as set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/012 and recommended approval for consultation, with no further amendment.

3. **Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) Submission Document (Regulation 19) (Report No: LOP/FH/16/013)**
- 3.1 The Forest Heath Core Strategy was adopted in May 2010. Following a successful High Court Challenge in May 2011, parts of Policy CS7 detailing how the overall housing need would be distributed between the settlements over a 20-year period (to 2031) were quashed (removed from the Strategy). Consequential amendments were also made to Policies CS1 (Spatial Strategy) and CS13 (Infrastructure and Developer Contributions).
- 3.2 Since then, the Council has been revisiting the quashed parts of the Core Strategy (known as the Single Issue Review) to determine the overall housing numbers and distribution, as well as developing a Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) to identify which sites should be developed, in order to achieve the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy and meet the outcomes of the Single Issue Review.
- 3.3 An 'Issues and Options' (Regulation 18) consultation on the SALP was completed between July to September 2012, with a second Issues and Options (Regulation 18) SALP consultation taking place between August and October 2015. A preferred options SALP (Regulation 18) consultation was completed between April and July 2016.
- 3.4 A final SALP Submission consultation (Regulation 19) is scheduled to take place early next year and it is the submission draft of the SALP is set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No LOP/FH/16/013, along with the final Local Plan Policies Map (as set out in Working Paper 2 to Report No LOP/FH/16/013).
- 3.5 Since the 2015 issues and options and the 2016 Preferred Options consultations on the SALP, Officers have been preparing the final submission version of the document. This is last stage of consultation prior to the document, together with the supporting information and evidence and representations received, being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in Public.
- 3.6 The SALP Submission document has been reviewed by the Planning Advisory Service and an external expert planning solicitor who have provided feedback and provides the Council confidence that the documents prepared are robust to minimise risk of a successful challenge. The Council's Communications Team have also read and commented upon documents.
- 3.7 Working Paper 1 to Report No LOP/FH/16/013 is the Site Allocations Local Plan Submission document. It supersedes and updates the 2015 and 2016 consultation documents and sets out the Council's sites for housing, employment and other uses to 2031.
- 3.8 Following on from the consultation on the SALP Preferred Options, the Working Group were provided with a summary of the key issues which had been raised on the planning policy context, settlement and preferred site options, economy and jobs, retail and town centres, gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople and settlement boundary reviews, along with any subsequent changes which had been made to the Submission draft, along with the reasons for the changes.

- 3.9 The final Regulation 19 consultation on the SALP submission document will be focused on the whether it is a 'legally compliant' and 'sound' document. The consultation will ask the public and stakeholders specific questions required by the Planning Inspectorate and requires that representations consider whether the tests of soundness have been met as set out in the introduction to the document in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/013.
- 3.10 Consultants have also been appointed to under the full Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) work in relation to the final Submission draft of the CS SIR document. A full report setting out these findings will accompany the document for consultation in January 2017.
- 3.11 The Council are planning for long term growth to give certainty in how and where settlements will grow within the district. This will ensure that service providers can plan and deliver the necessary infrastructure to enable the planned growth to happen when it is required. This would include such facilities as roads, sewers and water infrastructure.
- 3.12 A draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) accompanied the 2015 and 2016 SALP consultation documents. Since then, further work with infrastructure providers has taken place which has helped inform the selection of final sites in the SALP submission document. A further revised IDP will accompany the SALP submission document to further set out the infrastructure requirements to support development. Comments can also be made on this next iteration of the draft IDP during the 2017 consultation.
- 3.13 The Policies Map (formerly known as the Proposals Map) illustrates particular land uses throughout the district including areas for protection, such as Special Protection Areas and conservation areas, as well as employment and residential activities. It also identifies key sites for development. The Policies Map encompasses all Local Plan documents including policies in the Core Strategy (2010) and the Joint Development Management Policies document (2015). Working Paper 2 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/013 contained the updated Policies Map which has been produced for consultation alongside the 2017 SALP submission document. This allows the allocated sites to be viewed alongside other already adopted policies and constraints to assist when making consultation comments.
- 3.14 The final Submission (Regulation 19) CS SIR document will be considered by Cabinet on 13 December 2016 and Council on 21 December 2016 for approval for consultation and submission to the Secretary of State. A final consultation is planned from 10 January 2017 to 21 February 2017. The change in consultation date for the next consultation has also required an update to be made to the Local Development Scheme (timetable for plan preparation). This has been published on the Council's website. The amendment to the timeline does not affect the anticipated adoption of the document in December 2017.
- 3.15 Comments received during this next consultation will be submitted directly to the Secretary of State with the Local Plan documents for consideration through a Local Plan Examination led by an independent Planning Inspector. It is anticipated that submission of these documents will take place in early March 2017. However, should any factors arise which could cause delay and which

are beyond the Council's control, a further meeting of the Working Group will be arranged to outline options for the progressing of the Single Issue Review and any consequential impact on the Local Plan timetable itself.

Comments from the Local Plan Working Group

- 3.16 The Working Group considered the Submission draft of the Site Allocations Local Plan Submission document, as set out in Working Paper 1 to Report No: LOP/FH/16/013 and recommended approval for consultation, with no further amendment.

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2017/2018</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/060</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 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 officers:</b>	Paul Corney Head of Anglia Revenues Partnership <b>Tel:</b> 01842 756437 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:paul.corney@angliarevenues.gov.uk">paul.corney@angliarevenues.gov.uk</a>	
	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>	This report also sets out recommendations on the 2017/18 Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme (LCTRS) and technical changes levels from 1 April 2017.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that subject to the approval of Council, no change be made to the current Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme or Council Tax Technical Changes levels for 2017/2018, as detailed in Section 5 of Report No: CAB/FH/16/060.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As detailed in the body of the report</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looking at the scheme in isolation, changing the current LCTR scheme is not required from a financial perspective, as the current schemes are operating effectively, delivering a cost-neutral position.</li> <li>Members could reduce the maximum level of discount under the LCTR scheme to generate additional revenue for the Council to assist towards delivery of Council services as a result of the wider financial pressures. Providing a maximum of 90% discount (a reduction of 1.5% discount for working age claimants as the current scheme is 91.5%) would generate an additional £2,900 for Forest Heath (based on 9.4% share).</li> <li>Members could reduce the discount available for empty properties and uninhabitable properties to generate additional revenue for the council to assist towards delivery of council services. Complete removal of the current discounts/exemptions around class A and C properties would generate £21,000 for Forest Heath (based on 9.6% share).</li> </ul>
<b>Implications:</b>	
<p>Are there any <b>financial</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>As outlined in the body of the 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>
<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>
<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>The national Council Tax Reduction Scheme for pensioners will be determined by central government whilst the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme for people of working age is determined by each local authority. The scheme may be altered each year, giving the council the opportunity to take into consideration any local factors or budget constraints. Subsequent amendments may required further consultation and agreement.</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>An equality impact assessment was undertaken as part of the development of the 2013/2014 scheme in 2012. As there are no changes to the LCTR scheme the equality impact assessment is unchanged.</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)
<p><b>Reduction in collection rates</b> Council Tax collection rates could decrease over the year, reducing the scheme revenues</p>	High	ARP closely to monitor non-payment from working age claimants.	Medium
<p><b>Demand.</b> There is a risk of a higher demand on the LCTR Scheme.</p>	High	ARP to closely monitor caseload. The major precepting authorities will share the financial risks associated with LCTRS. Representatives from Forest Heath and other Suffolk billing authorities and Suffolk County Council are continuing to work together to monitor the county-wide framework.	Medium
<p><b>Ward(s) affected:</b></p>		All Wards	
<p><b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i></p>		<p><u>Extraordinary Council (16 January 2013)</u> – Local Council Tax Support 2013/2014 (<a href="#">Report No COU13/610</a>; <a href="#">Appendix A</a>; <a href="#">Appendix B</a>)</p> <p><u>Extraordinary Council (16 January 2013)</u> - Council Tax for Council Tax Base Setting Purposes 2013/2014 and Changes to the Level of Discounts and Exemptions in respect of Second Homes and some Empty Properties (<a href="#">Report No COU13/611</a>; <a href="#">Appendix 1</a>; <a href="#">Appendix 2</a>)</p> <p><u>Council (11 December 2013)</u> - Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2014/2015 (<a href="#">Report No COU13/654</a>)</p>	

	<p><u>Council (10 December 2014)</u> - Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2015/2016  <a href="#">(Report No COU/FH/14/006; Appendix A)</a></p> <p><u>Council (9 December 2015)</u> - Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2016/2017  <a href="#">(Report No COU/FH/15/040; Appendix A)</a></p>
<b>Documents attached:</b>	None

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

- 1.1 Since 1 April 2013, Forest Heath District Council has operated a Localised Council Tax Reduction Scheme (LCTRS) to replace the previous, centrally administered Council Tax Benefit. Forest Heath's scheme is aimed at:
- making provision to protect vulnerable people; and
  - supporting work incentives for claimants created by the Government's wider welfare reform.
- 1.2 Councils were also given the discretion in 2013 to increase council tax income; to charge up to 100% for some previously exempt properties, to charge up to 100% in respect of furnished empty properties (usually referred to as holiday homes), to charge up to 100% in respect of second homes and to charge up to 50% empty homes premium for properties that had been empty for over 2 years, with the aim of bringing them back into use.
- 1.3 Forest Heath's initial scheme for 2013-14 required working age claimants to pay 8.5% more of the council tax charge than previously. This requirement has been continued over the subsequent 3 financial years, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17.
- 1.4 The technical changes made are shown in table 1 below. Forest Heath also protected War Pensioners (pensioners are protected by the Government changes) from the reduction in maximum benefit and removed Second Adult Rebate for working age claimants.

**Table 1**

<b>Discounts</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14&amp;2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16 &amp; 2016/17</b>
Class A, empty, unfurnished and undergoing major repairs to render habitable	100% exemption for 12 months maximum	30% discount for a twelve month period	30% discount for a twelve month period
Class C, empty, substantially unfurnished	100% exemption for 6 months maximum	One month exemption only of 100%	One month exemption only of 100%
Second homes	10% discount	5% discount	No discount
Empty homes premium (property empty for more than 2 years)		Pay 150%	Pay 150%

## 2. Scheme Review – Financial Impacts

- 2.1 Council tax accounts where there has been a period of LCTRS awarded, show a collection rate of 84.7%, compared with our target of 90% over the two year period (and 83.3% in 2014-15). As expected, collection has partly relied upon a significant increase in arrangements to deduct council tax from Department for Work and Pension (DWP) Benefits. For comparison purposes, overall in-year collection for 2015/16 was 97.12% (compared to 96.97% in 2014/15).

- 2.2 Forest Heath has seen a reduction in LCTRS caseload of 4% compared to 2015 levels. A very small number of LCTRS customers have also received Housing Benefit reductions attributed to the Welfare Reform changes from April 2013, namely the Spare Room Subsidy Restriction and the Benefit Cap, with little demand for Exceptional Hardship payments which can be applied for using a specific application form available for this purpose.
- 2.3 In assessing the anticipated LCTRS expenditure for 2014/15 it was assumed that this would be at the 2013/14 level along with an assumption for bad debt was factored in to the budget. The actual 2014/15 LCTRS expenditure was therefore below budget due to the drop in overall caseload. Going forward, we assume neutral changes to the caseload as, whilst unemployment continues to fall, a major employer reducing staff significantly, ceasing to trade or relocating is difficult to predict.
- 2.4 In respect of the technical changes for 2015/16, these were broadly in line with the expected costs/budget for the year and it is assumed this will continue throughout the current year 2016/17.

### **3. Scheme Review – Behavioural and administrative impacts**

- 3.1 The Council's aim in setting the LCTRS scheme has so far been to achieve a balance in charging an amount of council tax to encourage working age claimants back in to work whilst setting the amount charged at an affordable and recoverable level.
- 3.2 By setting the amount payable on LCTRS at 8.5% of the charge, in most cases, where a customer is not paying we can effect recovery through attachment to benefit within a year and so the charge, with costs, is recoverable. If the amount payable was much higher than it is, it is likely that debt would not be recoverable and there would be a danger of creating a culture of non-payment of council tax.

### **4. Setting the 2017/18 scheme**

- 4.1 Continuing the current LCTRS and approach to technical changes would create a 'cost neutral scheme' for the council, notwithstanding reductions in the Local Council Tax Support Grant, which would have to be absorbed elsewhere in the council's 2017-18 budget setting process.
- 4.2 Changes could be made to the maximum benefit amount and technical changes, however, both of these would carry with them significant behavioural impacts which could affect overall yield.
- 4.3 National research shows that any further increase in the amount payable for working age LCTRS customers could increase administration costs and have a detrimental effect on collection rates, see the following reports: –
- (A) [Impacts of Council Tax Support Reduction on Arrears, Collection rates and Court Administration costs from 2014 \(New Policy Institute study\).](#)
- (B) [Joseph Rowntree Trust / New Policy Institute - Managing the challenges of localised Council Tax Support](#) and

(C) [Eric Ollerenshaw –An Independent Review of Local Council Tax Support Schemes](#)

- 4.4 Similarly, any changes to the discounts offered under the technical changes would have a direct impact on the Council's tax base for council tax setting purposes.
- 4.5 As both the LCTR scheme and council tax technical changes are discount and exemption based, any proposed changes have a direct impact on the Council's Tax Base for Council Tax setting purposes. These proposals will therefore feed into the Tax Base setting process during the Autumn 2016.

**5. Proposals for 2017/18 scheme**

- 5.1 Based on the overall findings of the scheme review outlined above in sections 2 and 3, the recommendation is to continue the LCTR scheme in its current form, including applying the current level of applicable amounts<sup>1</sup> within the LCTRS, for 2017/18.
- 5.2 It is also recommended to continue with the 2016/17 levels for second homes and empty properties, as set out in Table 1 above.
- 5.3 Due to the fact that the LCTRS is not changing this year there is no requirement to undertake specific consultation.
- 5.4 A parallel report is being considered by St Edmundsbury Borough Council Cabinet, with no proposed changes to their scheme for 2017-18, although there continue to be some differences in the technical changes between the two Councils.

---

<sup>1</sup> An applicable amount is the amount that the Government says that a family needs to live on each week. When a person's applicable amount has been calculated it is then compared with his/her income to work out the council tax reduction entitlement for which s/he is eligible.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Council Tax Base for Tax Setting Purposes 2017/2018</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/061</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
	<b>Council</b>	21 December 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>	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>	To set out the basis of the formal calculation for the Council Tax Base for the financial year 2017/2018.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p><b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that, subject to the approval of Council:</b></p> <p>(1) <b>The tax base for 2017/2018, for the whole of Forest Heath is 17,575.33 equivalent Band 'D' dwellings, as detailed in paragraph 1.4 of Report No: CAB/FH/16/061; and</b></p> <p>(2) <b>The tax base for 2017/2018 for the different parts of its area, as defined by parish or special expense area boundaries, are as shown in Appendix 2 of Report No CAB/FH/16/061.</b></p>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	
<i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i>		

<b>Consultation:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tax base figures provided within Appendix 2 of the report have been communicated to town and parish councils so they can start to factor these into their budget setting process.</li> </ul>		
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable</li> </ul>		
<b>Implications:</b>			
Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council Tax Base calculations are used to determine the New Homes Bonus received by the Council, and the level of council tax set by the Council. Once approved, the Tax Base for council tax collection purposes of 17,575.33 will be included in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.</li> </ul>		
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details	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)
The Council's ability to collect Council Tax income in the current economic climate.	High	Two separate collection rates have been applied to the taxbase calculations in respect of collectability. Communication plan in place.	Medium
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>		All Wards	
<b>Background papers:</b>		None	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		<b>Appendix 1:</b> CTB1 Return made to Central Government on 14 October 2016. <b>Appendix 2:</b> 2017/2018 Tax Base for each Parish and Town Council and for Forest Heath District Council.	



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

### **1.1 The Council Tax Base**

1.1.1 The Council Tax Base of the Council is the total taxable value at a point in time of all the domestic properties in its area, plus projected changes in the property base and after applying the estimated collection rate.

1.1.2 The total taxable value referred to above is arrived at by each dwelling being placed in an appropriate valuation band determined by the Valuation Office, with a fraction as set by statute being applied in order to convert it to a Band 'D' equivalent figure. These Band 'D' equivalent numbers are then aggregated at a district wide level and are also sub totalled for parishes. This has to be done by the Council responsible for sending the bills out and collecting the council tax ('the billing authority'). In two tier areas, district councils fulfil this function.

1.1.3 The Council Tax Base is used in the calculation of council tax. Each authority divides its total council tax required to meet its budget requirements by the Tax Base of its area to arrive at a band 'D' council tax.

### **1.2 Calculation of the tax base for tax setting purposes**

1.2.1 The calculation of the tax base for tax setting purposes consists of three stages:

- (a) Calculation of the tax base for New Homes Bonus purposes as at 3 October 2016 (DCLG return – CTB1);
- (b) analysis of Band 'D' equivalents over each of the Parish areas; and
- (c) adjustment of the Band 'D' equivalents to reflect changes in the tax base as a result of valuation changes, exemptions, discounts and a collection rate.

### **1.3 Tax base for New Homes Bonus purposes**

1.3.1 The Tax Base return CTB1 is used by central government for data collection and the calculation of New Homes Bonus (see Appendix 1). This return shows the analysis of properties across the eight bands for the following classifications of liability:

- (a) properties attracting 100% liability;
- (b) properties with an entitlement to a 25% discount;
- (c) properties with an entitlement to a 50% discount;
- (d) properties with an entitlement to a 100% discount;
- (e) exemptions;
- (f) discounts, including Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme discounts; and
- (g) Disabled Relief Adjustments.

1.3.2 The figures used to make the above calculations are derived from the Valuation List as deposited on 12 September 2016, and as amended to reflect any errors or omissions so far detected in reviewing that list.

## 1.4 Analysis of Band 'D' Properties

- 1.4.1 The Band 'D' Properties figure as at 3 October 2016 of 17,958.4 as quoted in the CTB1 form has been updated as at 31 October 2016 to allow for:
- any technical changes outlined in Report No: CAB/FH/16/060, contained elsewhere on this Cabinet agenda; and
  - potential growth in the property base during 2017/2018 taken from an average of the housing delivery numbers for those sites within the local plan and those that have planning permission, adjusted for an assumed level of discounts/exemptions within that growth of property base.
- 1.4.2 An allowance is then made for losses on collection, which assumes that overall collection rates will be maintained at 97.5%. In addition to this collection rate change, an adjustment has been made to allow for the collectability of the council tax arising from the Local Council Tax Support scheme, which has been assessed at 90%. **The resulting Tax Base for Council Tax collection purposes has been calculated as 17,575.33** which is an increase of 367.4 on the previous year.
- 1.4.3 The Table below shows the actual number of dwellings in each tax band based on the current valuations which are discounted to 1 April 1991 and the percentage in each band. There has been no national revaluation since that date.

Band	Tax Band values as at 01/04/1991 (£)	Actual Number of dwellings (Note 1)	Actual Number of dwellings as a percentage	Number of Chargeable dwellings (Note 2)	Relevant Proportion	Relevant Amount (Note 3)
@ (Note 4)				6.4	5/9	3.6
A	Up to 40,000	6,580	22.3%	4,062.3	6/9	2,708.2
B	40,001 to 52,000	9,782	33.2%	7,299.5	7/9	5,677.4
C	52,001 to 68,000	5,940	20.1%	4,301.8	8/9	3,823.8
D	68,001 to 88,000	4,012	13.6%	2,632.5	9/9	2,632.5
E	88,001 to 120,000	1,977	6.7%	1,264.5	11/9	1,545.5
F	120,001 to 160,000	703	2.4%	570.5	13/9	824.0
G	160,001 to 320,000	441	1.5%	393.0	15/9	654.9
H	Over 320,000	53	0.2%	44.3	18/9	88.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>29,488</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>20,574.7</b>		<b>17,958.4</b>
<b>Actual Taxbase after applying technical changes, an allowance for potential growth and collection rate</b>						<b>17,575.33</b>

Note 1: This is the total number of dwellings on the Valuation List before

making any adjustments (line 1 of the CTB return at Appendix 1).

Note 2: This is the number of chargeable dwellings after adjusting for discounts, exemptions and local council tax support but before applying the relevant proportion (ratio to Band D) (line 29 of the CTB return at Appendix 1).

Note 3: This is the total number of Band D equivalent dwellings as shown on line 31 of the CTB return at Appendix 1.

Note 4: Disabled reduction results in charging the property at one band lower (1/9th) than its actual band. The "@" figure relates to Band A properties which are eligible for a disabled reduction (1/9th below a Band A charge).

## 1.5 **Precept Payment Arrangements for 2017/2018**

1.5.1 In line with the delegated authority to administer the Council's financial affairs as outlined in the Constitution, the arrangements for the scheduling of the precept payments for 2017/2018, will be determined by the Head of Resources and Performance (Chief Financial Officer).

1.5.2 It is expected that the payments schedule for Parish and Town Councils will take the same form as previous years:

<b>AMOUNT OF PRECEPT</b>	<b>AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS</b>
Under £4,000	Full payment Friday, before 1 May 2017
£4,000 - £10,000	50% payment Friday, before 1 May 2017 50% payment Friday, before 1 August 2017
Over £10,000	50% payment Friday, before 1 May 2017 15% payment Friday, before 1 August 2017 35% payment Friday, before 1 October 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

## CTB(October 2016)

**Calculation of Council Tax Base**Please e-mail to : [ctb.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ctb.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Please enter your details after checking that you have selected the correct local authority name

Ver 1.0

Please select your local authority's name from this list

Check that this is your authority :

Forest Heath

E-code :

E3532

Local authority contact name :

Sharon Goddard

Local authority contact telephone number :

01842 756464

Local authority contact e-mail address :

Arpfinance@angliarevenues.gov.uk

**CTB(October 2016) form for Forest Heath***Completed forms should be received by DCLG by Friday 14 October 2016*

**Dwellings shown on the Valuation List  
for the authority on  
Monday 12 September 2016**

Band A  
entitled to  
disabled relief  
reduction  
COLUMN 1

Band A  
COLUMN 2

Band B  
COLUMN 3

Band C  
COLUMN 4

Band D  
COLUMN 5

Band E  
COLUMN 6

Band F  
COLUMN 7

Band G  
COLUMN 8

Band H  
COLUMN 9

TOTAL  
COLUMN 10

**Part 1**

1. Total number of dwellings on the Valuation List		6,580	9,782	5,940	4,012	1,977	703	441	53	29,488.0
2. Number of dwellings on valuation list exempt on 3 October 2016 (Class B & D to W exemptions)		457	759	1,041	1,119	621	92	31	3	4,123.0
3. Number of demolished dwellings and dwellings outside area of authority on 3 October 2016 (please see notes)		1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3.0
4. Number of chargeable dwellings on 3 October 2016 (treating demolished dwellings etc as exempt) (lines 1-2-3)		6,122	9,023	4,898	2,892	1,356	611	410	50	25,362.0
5. Number of chargeable dwellings in line 4 subject to disabled reduction on 3 October 2016		9	37	27	36	14	9	4	5	141.0
6. Number of dwellings effectively subject to council tax for this band by virtue of disabled relief (line 5 after reduction)	9	37	27	36	14	9	4	5		141.0
7. Number of chargeable dwellings adjusted in accordance with lines 5 and 6 (lines 4-5+6 or in the case of column 1, line 6)	9	6,150	9,013	4,907	2,870	1,351	606	411	45	25,362.0

## CTB(October 2016)

**Calculation of Council Tax Base**Please e-mail to : [ctb.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ctb.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Please enter your details after checking that you have selected the correct local authority name

Ver 1.0

8. Number of dwellings in line 7 entitled to a single adult household 25% discount on 3 October 2016	3	3,144	3,120	1,223	601	239	107	60	5	8,502.0
<i>Tax base after reduction</i>	<i>2.25</i>	<i>2358</i>	<i>2340</i>	<i>917.25</i>	<i>450.75</i>	<i>179.25</i>	<i>80.25</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>3.75</i>	
9. Number of dwellings in line 7 entitled to a 25% discount on 3 October 2016 due to all but one resident being disregarded for council tax purposes	0	37	66	48	23	7	4	3	0	188.0
<i>Tax base after reduction</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>27.75</i>	<i>49.5</i>	<i>36</i>	<i>17.25</i>	<i>5.25</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2.25</i>	<i>0</i>	
10. Number of dwellings in line 7 entitled to a 50% discount on 3 October 2016 due to all residents being disregarded for council tax purposes	0	2	4	1	0	7	0	5	2	21.0
<i>Reduction in tax base</i>										
11. Number of dwellings in line 7 classed as second homes on 3 October 2016 (b/fwd from Flex Empty tab)		65	43	38	21	20	10	11	5	213.0
12. Number of dwellings in line 7 classed as empty and receiving a zero% discount on 3 October 2016 (b/fwd from Flex Empty tab)		113	158	70	50	26	13	8	0	438.0
13. Number of dwellings in line 7 classed as empty and receiving a discount on 3 October 2016 and not shown in line 12 (b/fwd from Flex Empty tab)		16	34	18	6	3	1	0	0	78.0
14. Number of dwellings in line 7 classed as empty and being charged the Empty Homes Premium on 3 October 2016 (b/fwd from Flex Empty tab)		39	24	18	11	8	2	4	3	109.0
15. Total number of dwellings in line 7 classed as empty on 3 October 2016 (lines 12, 13 & 14).		168	216	106	67	37	16	12	3	625.0
16. Number of dwellings that are classed as empty on 3 October 2016 and have been for more than 6 months. NB These properties should have already been included in line 15 above.		85	86	44	25	23	7	7	3	280.0
16a. The number of dwellings included in line 16 above which are empty on 3 October 2016 because of the flooding that occurred between 1 December 2013 and 31 March 2014 and are only empty because of the flooding.		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0



**CTB(October 2016)**

**Calculation of Council Tax Base**

Please e-mail to : [ctb.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ctb.statistics@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Please enter your details after checking that you have selected the correct local authority name

Ver 1.0

**Part 2**

27. Number of dwellings equivalents after applying discounts and premiums to calculate tax base (Line 22)	8.25	5,353.97	8,201.60	4,583.95	2,714.20	1,287.70	578.25	394.75	44.25	23,166.9
28.Reduction in taxbase as a result of local council tax support (b/fwd from CT Support tab)	1.83	1,291.65	902.11	282.13	81.72	23.21	7.77	1.79	0.00	2,592.2
29. Number of dwellings equivalents after applying discounts, premiums and local tax support to calculate taxbase	6.4	4,062.3	7,299.5	4,301.8	2,632.5	1,264.5	570.5	393.0	44.3	20,574.7
30. Ratio to band D	5/9	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9	
31. Total number of band D equivalents after allowance for council tax support (to 1 decimal place) (line 29 x line 30)	3.6	2,708.2	5,677.4	3,823.8	2,632.5	1,545.5	824.0	654.9	88.5	17,958.4
32. Number of band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O exempt dwellings) in 2016-17 (to 1 decimal place)(line 25)										0.0
33. Tax base after allowance for council tax support (to 1 decimal place) (line 31 col 10 + line 32)										17,958.4

**Certificate of Chief Financial Officer**

I certify that the information provided on this form is based on the dwellings shown in the Valuation List for my authority on 12 September 2016 and that it accurately reflects information available to me about exemptions, demolished dwellings, disabled relief, discounts and premiums applicable on 3 October 2016 and, where appropriate, has been completed in a manner consistent with the form for 2015.

Chief Financial Officer : .....

Date : .....



### Parish Taxbase Figures 2017/2018

<b>Parish/Town</b>	<b>Taxbase 2017/2018 (Number of Band D Equivalent Dwellings)</b>
Barton Mills	337.58
Beck Row	923.76
Brandon (and Wangford)	2,454.94
Cavenham	48.54
Dalham	130.26
Elveden	99.34
Eriswell	218.17
Exning	722.91
Freckenham	133.67
Gazeley	250.53
Herringswell	118.06
Higham	72.73
Icklingham	140.74
Kentford	198.60
Lakenheath	1,294.33
Mildenhall	2,706.28
Moulton	550.53
Newmarket	5,363.04
Red Lodge	1,361.31
Santon Downham	86.38
Tuddenham	152.66
Worlington	210.97
<b>Total (District Taxbase)</b>	<b>17,575.33</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Allocation of Community Chest Funding 2017/2018</b>																																					
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/062</b>																																					
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016																																				
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Councillor Robin Millar Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities <b>Tel:</b> 07939 100937 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:robin.millar@forest-heath.gov.uk">robin.millar@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>																																					
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Davina Howes Head of Families and Communities <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757070 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:davina.howes@westsuffolk.gov.uk">davina.howes@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>																																					
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To update Cabinet following the review of applications for Community Chest funding 2017/2018 and to recommend funding allocations.																																					
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p><b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that:</b></p> <p><b>(1) The Cabinet notes the allocation of funding from the Community Chest as follows:</b></p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td><b>1. Alumah</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>2017-2018</b></td> <td><b>£3,700</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2. Arts For Us</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>2017-2018</b></td> <td><b>£9,520</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>3. Fresh Start: New Beginnings</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>2017-2018</b></td> <td><b>£10,000</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>4. Our Special Friends</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>2017-2018</b></td> <td><b>£6,000</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>5. Rural Coffee Caravan</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>2017/2018</b></td> <td><b>£3,210</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>6. Suffolk West Citizens Advice (MoneySmart)</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>2017/2018</b></td> <td><b>£27,192</b></td> </tr> </table>		<b>1. Alumah</b>				<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£3,700</b>	<b>2. Arts For Us</b>				<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£9,520</b>	<b>3. Fresh Start: New Beginnings</b>				<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£10,000</b>	<b>4. Our Special Friends</b>				<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£6,000</b>	<b>5. Rural Coffee Caravan</b>				<b>2017/2018</b>	<b>£3,210</b>	<b>6. Suffolk West Citizens Advice (MoneySmart)</b>				<b>2017/2018</b>	<b>£27,192</b>
<b>1. Alumah</b>																																						
	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£3,700</b>																																				
<b>2. Arts For Us</b>																																						
	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£9,520</b>																																				
<b>3. Fresh Start: New Beginnings</b>																																						
	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£10,000</b>																																				
<b>4. Our Special Friends</b>																																						
	<b>2017-2018</b>	<b>£6,000</b>																																				
<b>5. Rural Coffee Caravan</b>																																						
	<b>2017/2018</b>	<b>£3,210</b>																																				
<b>6. Suffolk West Citizens Advice (MoneySmart)</b>																																						
	<b>2017/2018</b>	<b>£27,192</b>																																				

	<p><b>7. The Volunteer Network</b></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><b>2017/18</b></td> <td><b>£10,299.33</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2018/19</b></td> <td><b>£10,299.33</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2019/20</b></td> <td><b>£10,299.33</b></td> </tr> </table> <p><b>8. Unit Twenty Three</b></p> <p><b>2017/2018 £5,000</b></p> <p><b>(2) The Cabinet gives delegated authority to the Head of Families and Communities, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities, to approve the funding allocated to the organisations listed below, with the total sum allocated being no more than £63,976.67:</b></p> <p><b>9. Abundant Life Church</b>  <b>10. ActivLives</b>  <b>11. FamilyCarersNet</b>  <b>12. HomeStart (Lakenheath)</b>  <b>13. Sharing Parenting</b>  <b>14. YOPEY Befriending</b></p>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>£10,299.33</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>£10,299.33</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>£10,299.33</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	<b>£10,299.33</b>						
<b>2018/19</b>	<b>£10,299.33</b>						
<b>2019/20</b>	<b>£10,299.33</b>						
<p><b>Key Decision:</b></p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>						
<p><i>The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within <b>48 hours</b> and cannot be actioned until <b>five clear working days of the publication of the decision</b> have elapsed. This item is included on the Decisions Plan.</i></p>							
<p><b>Consultation:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As set out in the report.</li> </ul>						
<p><b>Alternative option(s):</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council could chose not to provide any grant funding. However, it is recognised that some support to the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector is required. The Community Chest also enables the council to commission services to support the delivery of the Families and Communities priorities.</li> </ul>						
<p><b>Implications:</b></p>							
<p><i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications?</i>  <i>If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding allocated within the budget available for the Community Chest scheme.</li> </ul>						
<p><i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications?</i>  <i>If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>						
<p><i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>						

<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's approach to grants has been the subject to an Equality Impact Assessment and no negative consequences have been identified.</li> </ul>	
<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)
Organisations are not aware of our approach to grants	Medium	Implementing a wide ranging communications plan	Low
Requests for funding exceed the amount of money available	Medium	Eligibility criteria and an evaluation scoring matrix to be used to identify best fit and value for money	Low
Organisations do not have the capacity to respond to the council's approach to commissioning	Medium	Support provided to organisations and a phased approach to be taken to enable organisations to become familiar with the new approach	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>		None	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## 1. **2017/2018 Allocations**

- 1.1 Applications for Community Chest funding for 2017/2018 closed on 30 September 2016. A total of 23 applications were received from a wide variety of organisations.
- 1.2 The total budget for Community Chest 2017/2018 stands at £142,904 which includes £69,054 from Suffolk Public Health who have allocated money to each district and borough council. This was a one-off funding stream and will not be repeated in future years. The purpose of the Public Health funding is to support activity to improve health across the area. Forest Heath and Suffolk County Council have agreed to work collaboratively to improve the level of intervention, enhance our mutual understanding of needs within the county, and deliver long term benefits to all parties.
- 1.3 Community Chest applicants can apply for a maximum of three years. This is subject to budget setting each year and satisfactory monitoring and review of each project.
- 1.4 In determining this year's allocations, each application was assessed against the scheme's criteria. Following consideration by the Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities, it was felt that a number of the applications received were not appropriate for Community Chest funding. Those **not** suitable for funding are listed below. In some cases, it is felt that alternative funding sources may be available. It is suggested that officers in the Families and Communities Team work with these organisations to source alternative funding. These alternative sources could be locality budgets, or from external sources such as Suffolk Fit Villages, sport's national governing bodies, such as Sport England and the Suffolk Community Foundation.

Applications not considered appropriate for Community Chest funding:

- i. Bury St Edmunds Volunteer Centre
  - ii. Cath 22, Suffolk Positive Futures
  - iii. Community Action Suffolk (Volunteering)
  - iv. Community Action Suffolk (Locality)
  - v. Creative Arts East
  - vi. Keystone Development Trust
  - vii. Suffolk Accident and Rescue Service
  - viii. Suffolk Coalition of Disabled People
  - ix. The Matthew Project
- 1.5 Following detailed consideration, it was felt that 14 applications met the Scheme's criteria and should be allocated funding. These are detailed below:

<b>1. Project name:</b> Alumah	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £3,700
<b>Project details:</b> My aim is to provide a safe space for (women, men, young people) who have fallen victim to domestic abuse, to attend for coffee and education; group work, raising awareness and self efficacy for women, men and young people. Support/after care groups.	
<b>2. Project name:</b> Arts For Us	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £9,520
<b>Project details:</b> Art's for Us provides out of school (i.e. during the school holidays and half term breaks) recreational, educational and sporting opportunities to all children.  The project gives children and their families a chance to meet, make friends and learn to trust adults outside the immediate family; this acts as a building block for future trust and support between each other outside the project.	
<b>3. Project name:</b> Fresh Start : New Beginnings	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £10,000
<b>Project details:</b> The organisation was set up in response to a perceived unmet need for therapeutic interventions for child sexual abuse victims and their families.  Children work through their plans with a dedicated specialist worker on a one to one basis for several weeks or months.	
<b>4. Project name:</b> Our Special Friends	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £6,000
<b>Project details:</b> The charity offers a range of practical and emotional support services to help isolated and vulnerable individuals continue to benefit from animal companionship during illness, bereavement and other crises.  Current admin support is unable to keep up with back end office tasks e.g. filing, phone answering, fundraising applications, volunteer packs and badges, organising and managing events let alone entering new client information. In order to continue our work across Forest Heath OSF needs to generate a consistent income stream to cover ongoing costs.	

<b>5. Project name:</b> Rural Coffee Caravan	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £3,210
---	--

**Project details:**

The aim is to combat rural isolation and loneliness throughout Suffolk by visiting rural locations and holding events that act as a catalyst for people to talk with one another in a friendly and non-threatening atmosphere.

Funding to visit 6 rural villages lacking in amenities or social activity locations decided in consultation with the district council, each lasting 2 hours per week and providing a social opportunity alongside a route into services via the provision of information and our sign posting service.

<b>6. Project name:</b> West Suffolk Citizens Advice (MoneySmart)	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £27,192
---	---

**Project details:**

Funding is required to continue this successful scheme which aims to:

- To maintain contacts in the community and communicate changes in the availability of sources of help.
- To provide money management training to small groups.
- To raise awareness of the dangers of scams and give examples of current scams and how people can protect themselves.
- To help people to save money on energy costs including how to switch energy providers and reduce energy use.
- To promote understanding of safe methods of saving and borrowing, and steer people away from doorstep lenders and high interest credit schemes.

<b>7. Project name:</b> The Volunteer Network	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> 2017/18 - £10,299.33 2018/19 - £10,299.33 2019/20 - £10,299.33
--	--

**Project details:**

The Voluntary Network operates Community Transport and a Befriending Service. They provide support across Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury, with offices in both Newmarket and Haverhill.

Befriending Service – Team of volunteers provide one to one support to those who would otherwise be isolated. Volunteers spend an hour per week to offer friendship and support.

They propose to further develop the service with Befriending Connect. They have established that some clients would benefit from extending contact beyond one to one visits. In particular, many would welcome attending Day Centres or social groups but would welcome the support of the service to help to identify and resolve any barriers – such as transport.



<b>8. Project name:</b> Unit Twenty Three (Freefall)	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £5,000
<p><b>Project details:</b> Unit Twenty Three is a social enterprise aiming to support young people and creative enterprise.</p> <p>Freefall, is a powerful play developed by Young Carers and professional artists. Using Freefall as a stimulus, the Project will train Young Carers to facilitate postshow workshops, where Young Caring can be explored with Freefall's audiences.</p>	

- 1.6 It should be noted that the Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities declared an interest in two applications where the Portfolio Holder knows the applicant in a personal capacity. In both cases the funding application was considered and approved by the Leader of the Council.
- 1.7 Of the total funding of £142,904, some £74,929 has been allocated. A number of applications were received which meet the Community Chest criteria and merit some level of funding. Officers from the Families and Communities Team are discussing with the relevant organisations the details of the funding bids and projects. Therefore the exact allocation of funding awarded to these organisations is still to be confirmed. It is proposed that the remaining £67,974 be used for these projects. Delegated approval is sought for the Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities, in consultation with the Head of Families and Communities, to decide the funding allocations to the organisations listed below, with the total funding not exceeding £67,974:

<b>9. Project name:</b> Abundant Life Church	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £tbc
<p><b>Project details:</b> The project, 'E.P.I.C dad', celebrates, supports and empowers fathers to be their best for their children and thrive in the privileged role of being a dad. E.P.I.C stands for: Encourager (bringing out the best in children) – Provider (meeting needs within the family) – Instructor (passing on skills for life) – Carer (giving love and support).</p> <p>The project will support fathers and their families who will in turn offer support to other fathers and families. Some of the dads accessing the project will become more involved in the running of the project and be trained as project volunteers.</p> <p><b>Suggested funding condition:</b> Officers will work with the project to establish the finer details. Exact funding allocation to be confirmed.</p>	

<b>10. Project name:</b> ActivLives	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £tbc
<p><b>Project details:</b> The Town &amp; Bridge Project was established in 2006. In 2012 the project became a Charity called ActivLives to support and motivate people aged 45 plus, across Ipswich and Suffolk to improve their own health and well-being.</p> <p>The project will hold Health and Wellbeing events for members and the general public. These events will offer taster session for adapted sports, to encourage people to join the satellite groups or Lakenheath hub. To support these events ActivLives will invite other organisations such as OneLife Suffolk, Rural Coffee Caravan and Age UK Suffolk</p> <p><b>Suggested funding condition:</b> Officers will work with the project to establish the finer details. Exact funding allocation to be confirmed.</p>	

<b>11. Project name:</b> FamilyCarersNet	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £tbc
<p><b>Project details:</b> The purpose of FamilyCarersNet is to provide flexible support for a carer's mental, emotional and physical health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Funding shall include creation of the 'FamilyCarersNet Health Toolbox', which packages the services into a digital-technology platform, as well as offline and entity that people can access for short, medium and long-term support.</p> <p><b>Suggested funding condition:</b> The Portfolio Holder for Families and Communities would like to meet with this organisation along with Officers from the Families and Communities Team to discuss the broader scope for this project. The exact allocation of funding is to be confirmed.</p>	

<b>12. Project name:</b> HomeStart (Lakenheath)	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £tbc
<p><b>Project details:</b> Home-Start aims to give support to families who may be struggling to cope with a variety of challenges including post-natal illness, disability, isolation, the demands of parenting young children, bereavement or multiple births.</p> <p>They are now expanding HomeStart into the Lakenheath area and will be offering a package of support to the Lakenheath RAF base. The support they want to offer is their home visiting befriending service and a weekly support group.</p> <p>Funding is required to offer the home visiting professional befriending service and to recruit volunteers who are local to the area who will understand what life</p>	

is like for families living on the bases.

**Suggested funding condition:**

Officers are seeking clarity on the financial support that may be available from the USAF for this project. As such the exact funding allocation is to be confirmed.

<b>13. Project name:</b> Sharing Parenting	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £tbc
<b>Project details:</b> Sharing Parenting aims to provide a range of parenting programmes including Raising Children, Sibling Rivalry and Raising Teenagers, supporting and empowering parents to build resilient families and communities.  After a comprehensive needs assessment we would like to apply for funding to support the needs of parents and families in Forest Heath as identified in the assessment by professionals, schools and parents themselves.  <b>Suggested funding condition:</b> Officers within the Families and Communities Team will work with Sharing Parenting to review their request for funding and consider the most cost effective way forward. The amount allocated is to be confirmed.	

<b>14. Project name:</b> YOPEY (Befriending)	<b>Proposed Funding Allocation</b> £tbc
<b>Project details:</b> Many adults, especially the elderly, suspect and fear the young. In part this fear is created by the negative press about the young, portraying them as binge-drinking, drug-taking violent hoodies.  To set up and run for one year a YOPEY Befriender scheme between one or two schools and one residential care home for the elderly in Forest Heath. In particular the project wants the young people to learn to relate to, and not fear, elderly people living with dementia.  <b>Suggested funding condition:</b> Officers will work with the project to establish the finer details. Exact funding allocation to be confirmed.	

This page is intentionally left blank

# Cabinet



**Forest Heath**  
District Council

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Location Filming in Suffolk</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/FH/16/063</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	13 December 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Lance Stanbury Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07970 947704 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk">lance.stanbury@forest-heath.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead Officers:</b>	<p>Andrea Mayley Service Manager (Development and Growth) <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757343 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:andrea.mayley@westsuffolk.gov.uk">andrea.mayley@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Jonathan Miles Senior Growth Officer <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757128 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:jonathan.miles@westsuffolk.gov.uk">jonathan.miles@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a></p>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To delegate authority to Film Fixer Ltd (Trading as Screen Suffolk) to issue permissions to filming companies to film on Council property.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that delegated authority is granted to Film Fixer Ltd (trading as Screen Suffolk) to issue permissions for filming in West Suffolk and to collect film fees for activity on Council land and premises on behalf of Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council, as detailed in Report No: CAB/FH/16/063.</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>  <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>(a) <i>A key decision means an executive decision, which pending any further guidance from the Secretary of State, is likely to:</i></p> <p>(i) <i>Be significant in terms of its effects on</i></p>	

	<i>communities living or working in an area in the Borough/District.</i>		
<i>The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within <b>48 hours</b> and cannot be actioned until <b>five clear working days of the publication of the decision</b> have elapsed. This item is included on the Decisions Plan.</i>			
<b>Consultation:</b>	In addition to the wider consultation ( <i>Suffolk Film Plan: A film, TV and broadcast media hub for Suffolk, 2015</i> ) the Screen Suffolk proposal has been shared and discussed with Council services. Feedback has been positive and staff are keen to work with Screen Suffolk.		
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	To retain control of permissions to filming companies without Screen Suffolk.		
<b>Implications:</b>			
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screen Suffolk will ensure that neither Council is financially worse off as a result of this new arrangement.</li> </ul>		
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Screen Suffolk will liaise with a single point of contact.</li> </ul>		
<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"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please see main report</li> </ul>		
<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)
Unsuitable filming on council premises	High	Close liaison with Screen Suffolk regarding enquiries	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>		None	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		<b>Appendix 1</b> - Screen Suffolk Film Partnership <b>Appendix 2</b> - Draft Screen Suffolk Best Practice Guide for local councils	

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 Suffolk Public Sector Leaders at their March 2016 meeting agreed the following recommendations:
- i. *Agree that Suffolk commits to becoming a 'Film Friendly' county where the screen industries are valued and filming is made as easy as possible. Ask officers to co-ordinate their approach and develop protocols to cover filming in public spaces and on publicly- owned land;*
  - ii. *Agree the proposal to establish a Suffolk Film Office;*
  - iii. *Approve the request to SPSL from the Screen Industries Steering Group to commit £170,000 over two years from pooled Business rates to fund the Suffolk Film Office in 2016/17 and 2017/18;*
  - iv. *Delegate to Chief Executives authority to commit up to a further £50,000 from pooled Business rates to fund the Suffolk Film Office in 2016/17 and 2017/18.*
- 1.2 A procurement exercise took place and in August 2016 the film office (*Screen Suffolk*) contract was awarded to Film Fixer Ltd by Suffolk County Council. Film Fixer is a location service with extensive experience in the sector. For example, the company already acts as the film office for twenty three London boroughs, where it trades under the names of the respective councils. In delivering the Suffolk contract, Film Fixer Ltd will trade as *Screen Suffolk*.
- 1.3 Work has now begun in earnest to deliver the contract. A *Screen Suffolk* website is being set up, a locations library of council owned property is being put together and a brand identity has been created.

## **2. Current Position in West Suffolk**

- 2.1 Currently there is no set process for handling film enquiries in West Suffolk. Any enquires are typically received by Corporate Communications which are then directed to the relevant service which is usually Leisure and Heritage who are responsible for locations that historically have been used for filming purposes, such as West Stow, Abbey Gardens and Nowton Park.

## **3. Delegation of Authority to Film Fixer Ltd**

- 3.1 At present each district in Suffolk has its own process for granting permissions to film on council land. This is confusing for location managers who are not familiar with council boundaries and faced with a plethora of different permissions processes and fee structures across the county.
- 3.2 As referenced above (in 1.1), it has been agreed in principle that Suffolk authorities will adopt a common process for granting permissions for filming in the county on council- owned land and premises and that Film Fixer Ltd will administer this process through its existing online service. Before work can begin on this part of the contract, each district is required to delegate authority to the company to act as its agent for the issue of filming permissions. Similar action is required by Suffolk County Council in respect of the delegation of highways closure permissions.

- 3.3 This delegation of authority to Film Fixer only applies to the district, borough and county councils in Suffolk. Where a company wishes to film on land or premises owned by Town and Parish Councils they will continue to negotiate these arrangements separately with the relevant town and parish councils as they have done previously.

#### **4. Financial and Governance Implications**

- 4.1 Charges for film services are made under Section 63 of the Local Government Act 2003 which empowers the council to recover the cost of discretionary services. Fees are charged on a cost-recovery basis and the income arising does not exceed the cost of providing the service. Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council currently handle film licences through the Leisure and Culture, Economic Development and Communications services.
- 4.2 At present, annual income from filming on council land is low, typically less than a thousand pounds per authority. The delegation of authority for film permissions to Film Fixer Ltd will result in a net growth in income to councils across Suffolk. Film Fixer Ltd aims to grow the number of filming days in the county from fewer than 50 in 2015/16 to 300 by 2018/19 and there will be a commensurate increase in location fees into district councils. This would bring £7,500,000 of spend to the local economy in each subsequent year (this is based on £25,000 per day; Creative England states an average £17,000-£32,000 is spent locally per day of filming).
- 4.3 Film Fixer Ltd will collect fees on all location filming across Suffolk on a cost-recovery basis and on each occasion will retain 50% as its share of the fee to cover operating expenses in respect of the shoot. The remaining 50% of the film fee will be credited to the relevant district council. It is important to note that the 50% retained by Film Fixer Ltd is not a commission: Film Fixer will support the location filming from the beginning to the end of the process - visiting sites where necessary, being present at larger shoots and making all necessary arrangements - and it will thereby incur costs. This role would have previously been performed by council officers and included in the location fee.

#### **5. Risks**

- 5.1 There is a risk that the nature of certain filming could be considered questionable or inappropriate. There would need to be a clear route of communication between Screen Suffolk and the Film Champion representative at West Suffolk to ensure that the Council is aware of any potentially damaging or politically sensitive filming enquiries.

#### **6. Recommendation**

- 6.1 That delegated authority is granted to Film Fixer Ltd (trading as Screen Suffolk) to issue permissions for filming in West Suffolk and to collect film fees for activity on council land and premises on behalf of Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council.



# Screen Suffolk Film Partnership

The Screen Suffolk Film Partnership aims to promote Suffolk as the most film friendly County in the UK. We believe that the Film industry will respond, if we create the right conditions. If we succeed in attracting inward investment, there are considerable benefits to be gained, but before we can claim to be “Film Friendly” we have to earn our reputation.

## **What the film industry wants from Screen Suffolk**

- Short lead in times, efficient permitting process
- Reasonable fees, and a transparent charging policy
- Accessible locations – assumed consent
- Photogenic locations, amazing skies and good weather
- Access to local, professional crew and facilities

## **What local residents want from Screen Suffolk**

- Minimal disruption
- Job opportunities and career development
- Training for young people looking for a start in the film business
- Increased production spend in Suffolk
- Increased visibility and associated film tourism
- Feel good factor

## **The Partnership Pledge**

- **Screen Suffolk** will strive to ensure that the partnership is able to work together as an effective body and that the lines of communication between all partners remain open.
- **The local authorities, agencies and public bodies of Suffolk**, pledge to make Suffolk a film friendly County by working within the Screen Suffolk Best Practice Guide.
- **The Creative Industries** agree to abide by the Screen Suffolk Filming Guidelines, in addition to the legal requirements imposed on filming.

## **The Suffolk Filming Partnership as a whole agrees to:**

- Act in a professional, honest and open manner in all our communications.
- Be flexible in our approach.
- Be accountable for our own actions.
- Understand the needs of others members of the partnership.

## Key Stakeholder Actions

### Screen Suffolk will:

- Be the main point of contact for all filming in Suffolk in order to minimise administration and deliver a timely, consistent, first class service to the creative industries.
- Ensure the county's offer in terms of locations, crews and facilities receives maximum exposure.
- Work with local authorities and location owners on filming requests
- Ensure that film crews are covered by at least £5 million Public Liability Insurance
- Ensure that productions inform local businesses and residents when any filming may cause disruption e.g. traffic management. Production letters are to include contact details of Screen Suffolk.
- Identify potentially problematic shoots, e.g. stunts, and make the relevant authorities aware in a timely fashion. Seek permission from production companies to initiate and co-ordinate PR opportunities, including credits, arising from any significant filming in the county, particularly during the time of first release.
- Collate data from all the partnership organisations and visiting production companies regarding filming activity and production spend in the county for the purposes of providing statistical information to funding agencies and government reports, enhancing Suffolk's standing in the film industry and encouraging support from the private sector.
- Offer support and advice to local and private bodies within the partnership
- Act as a go-between for creative industries and private and public bodies in case of dispute.

**The Local Authorities, and Agencies of Suffolk** acknowledge that working together within the partnership will ensure the maximum benefits to Suffolk in terms of attracting and managing filming. They will:

- Support Screen Suffolk to become the first point of call for all productions wishing to film in Suffolk, and to follow the Screen Suffolk Best Practice Guide.
- Adopt film friendly policies, recognising that film companies do not have long preparation times.
- Fully commit to, actively encourage and support the creative industries in Suffolk.
- Communicate effectively with the partners.
- Recommend suitable locations in their area to be put forward for a location brief.
- Provide relevant data and information to Screen Suffolk.
- Adopt common fee structure, film licences and traffic management protocols
- Maintain confidentiality regarding filming in the region where appropriate.
- Allow the partnership to share in PR opportunities whenever possible.

**Film Makers working in Suffolk** will be asked to abide by the "Screen Suffolk Filming Guidelines" which sets out how we expect film makers to behave.

- To keep Screen Suffolk informed throughout the production process.

- To behave with consideration for residents and businesses affected by filming.
- To know and follow the law, especially with regard to H&S, traffic regulations and employment.
- As far as possible to use local suppliers and facilities.
- To supply data and information about filming to help improve the service.
- To work with Screen Suffolk to promote filming in the County
- When appropriate to offer screen credits to Screen Suffolk, and any locations, suppliers and crew who have assisted on the production.

If you are a production company, an agency, facilities company or have a location based in Suffolk and would like to join the Suffolk Filming Partnership; please digitally sign a copy of the Screen Suffolk Filming Partnership [here](#) and email a jpeg of your logo to: [Partnership@screensuffolk.com](mailto:Partnership@screensuffolk.com)

**DRAFT SCREEN SUFFOLK BEST PRACTICE GUIDE**

Contents:

1. Introduction
2. Scope of the Best Practice Guide
3. Suffolk is open for business – need for assumed consent
4. Role of the Screen Suffolk
5. Role of the District Council
6. Role of Suffolk County Council
7. Role of the Location Manager / Producer
8. Role of Private landowners
9. Provision of information about filming
10. Parking issues
11. Traffic management, road closures and the need to control traffic
12. Handling of complaints
13. Review and development of this guide
14. Fees and charges

## **1. Introduction**

Suffolk wants to increase film activity taking place in the county. To this end, Suffolk local authorities have engaged FilmFixer Ltd to create and manage “Screen Suffolk”. FilmFixer has extensive experience managing film offices on behalf of local authorities.

FilmFixer, trading as Screen Suffolk, aims to establish a “Screen Suffolk Partnership” between all film related stakeholders in the county. The stakeholders will be from the following sectors:

- a) Film industry (film production companies, crew, facility and service companies)
- b) Agencies and organisations (such as the Police, RSPB, National Trust and others)
- c) Suffolk County Council and the seven District Councils, (represented by FilmFixer Ltd trading as Screen Suffolk).

In order to get the partnership underway, our first task is to set out the way we will work with and represent the district and local councils. We aim to do so by working with the councils to agree a “best practice guide.

## **2. Scope of the Best Practice Guide**

The aim of this document is to establish best practice guidance for the local authorities and FilmFixer (trading as Screen Suffolk). We will set out the different roles and expectations, and agree to standards for issuing film permits, traffic control etc. The best practice guidance will eventually form part of the Screen Suffolk Partnership Agreement. It draws on existing good practice in responding to and supporting filming in Suffolk. It will be a “living” document, as it will grow and develop as the service grows and develops.

### **3. Suffolk is open for business – assumed consent**

Film Makers are risk averse; they tend to go to locations where they know that permission will be granted. There is nothing worse than showing the perfect location to the director, then discovering (much too late in the day) that the location is unavailable for whatever reason.

Experienced location managers simply do not show a location to the director until they know it is available. This means that any delay in finding out availability may prevent a perfect location being put forward.

Screen Suffolk would like to establish a “presumption of consent”, for locations we offer up. We need to know exactly who is happy to be notified (i.e. told, not asked) about filming, and who has to be contacted in advance to give prior consent.

We aim to get to a position where the district and county council will “delegate powers” to Screen Suffolk, allowing us to grant written licences to film to film companies without undergoing lengthy delays while further third party consent is being sought.

## **4. Role of Screen Suffolk**

Screen Suffolk will act a one stop service to film-makers, issuing permits, co-ordinating advice and offering support to productions wanting to film in the county. Specific roles will include coordination of on on-and off-street parking, liaison with Police, use of highways, traffic control and road closure notices, and the supply of specific licences for allowing obstructions on the highway.

It is crucial for Screen Suffolk to make its role clear to the partnership, ensuring that stakeholders understand that Screen Suffolk are acting to support their commercial interests.

Screen Suffolk personnel will understand and follow the Screen Suffolk Partnership Agreement, making sure that film companies working in the county are aware of their responsibilities under the agreement, as well as under the law. Our role will be to highlight health and safety issues, risk assessments in a film context, highways and traffic management and the various elements of legislation relevant to filming. We will:

- a. Represent the county council and district councils as their film service provider
- b. Facilitate positive publicity and awareness-raising about the value of filming to Suffolk's economic, social and cultural wellbeing;
- c. Act as a sign-post for locations in Suffolk
- d. Work with stakeholders to identify resources for supporting filming, for instance in identifying and applying for training grants and other potential resources;
- e. Facilitate a range of forums for discussion and development of best practice;
- f. Manage a self-regulated mediation process for disputes arising between film-makers and location owners, agencies and other stakeholders;
- g. Provide analysis of data supplied by FilmApp, our online application process, in order to understand the wider picture of filming in Suffolk.
- h. Developing and coordinating training and professional development for film industry professionals in the County.

## **5. Role of the District Council**

Each District Council should:

- a. Appoint a "film champion" to meet with Screen Suffolk and to act as the point of contact.
- b. Agree to establish a common framework for filming, addressing permits, fees and lead in times.
- c. Work with Screen Suffolk to establish quick and efficient processes for licencing film related traffic management, use of film equipment on the highway, parking and agreements to film on council property.
- d. Help Screen Suffolk gain access to council owned locations
- e. Use the councils internal and external communications network to publicise the work of Screen Suffolk, and spread positive publicity about the values of filming.

## **6. Role of Suffolk County Council**

The County Council should:

- a. Assist Screen Suffolk's efforts to establish the film partnership
- b. Act as trouble-shooter when Screen Suffolk encounter obstruction
- c. Work with Screen Suffolk to establish quick and efficient processes for licencing film related traffic management, use of film equipment on the highway, parking and agreements to film on council property.
- d. Help Screen Suffolk gain access to council owned locations
- e. Use the council's internal and external communications network to publicise the work of Screen Suffolk, and spread positive publicity about the values of filming.

## **7. Role of the Location Manager:**

Location Managers working in Suffolk should:

- a. Be the main point of contact with Screen Suffolk, residents and businesses
- b. Make agreements with Screen Suffolk and location owners on matters affecting filming at specific locations
- c. Make sure that residents and businesses are kept informed about any filming activity that may affect them.
- d. Manage the shoot on the day, always aiming to minimise disruption.
- e. Feedback information about the production and about their experience to Screen Suffolk

## **8. Role of Location Owner:**

The Owners of Locations in Suffolk should:

- a. Be prepared to show Location managers around the location at short notice, and for no fees.
- b. Allow filming to take place in good faith, understanding the requirements of the film company.
- c. Allow their contact phone number, or the contact phone number of their registered agent to be displayed on the Screen Suffolk website.

## **9. Provision of information about filming**

Screen Suffolk will be the sole central repository of information about filming. All requests for information should be channelled through Screen Suffolk, so that filming is coordinated correctly.

## **10. Parking**

- a. Parking charges should be applied to film productions at the same rate as any other business or individual requesting suspensions and dispensations.
- b. Income from parking will be collected by Screen Suffolk and passed on the relevant council quarterly.
- c. Screen Suffolk will make an additional administration charge for assisting film productions in applying for and managing parking.
- d. Film productions should apply for all parking via Screen Suffolk, if the council receives a parking request from a production, they should be redirected to Screen Suffolk

## **11. Traffic management, road closures and the need to control traffic**

Screen Suffolk should be the first port of call for Location Managers and Producers wishing to film on the public highway, or make changes to signage, road markings or street furniture. Screen Suffolk will co-ordinate all requests, making sure that the closure or alterations are carried out in such a way as to minimise any disruption to the road network. In particular, Screen Suffolk will coordinate with the relevant council's Traffic Manager to ensure that there are no other planned obstructions, such as street works, on that site and that the legal requirements of the Network Management Duty are maintained.

Any obstruction on the public highway must have the express permission, issued by Screen Suffolk who will licence (with permission of the council) specific film related equipment such as scaffolding, cranes, and tracking. Each location and production will be unique in its requirements.

A Technical Recce with all the concerned parties should be held in good time where details can be discussed on site, and agreement reached about what can and cannot be done.

The current legislation on road closures for filming is unclear, councils use different legislation, depending on their interpretation of the Road Traffic Act 1984. Most councils use a Temporary Traffic Regulation Notice (TTRN) or order (TTRO) under section 16a (certain events) or section 14 (works). Kent, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire have sponsored private bills which allow road closures to be carried out specifically for filming. Creative England has been lobbying government to clarify the law, there was a bill put before parliament in 2014, which has not yet passed.

## **12. Handling of complaints**

Film related complaints should be handled by Screen Suffolk in the first instance. If a complaint is received by the council, then Screen Suffolk should be informed and offered the opportunity to respond. If the complainant is not satisfied, they will be offered the opportunity to complain using the council's formal complaints procedure.

Screen Suffolk will do all it can to resolve the complaint, at the time it is received, but from time to time, complaints may have to be escalated. In any event, the complaint, and any action taken to resolve the complaint will be recorded.

## **13. Review and development of this guide**

We will be using this guide to help us establish a working relationship between Screen Suffolk and the councils. We will make amendments to the best practice guide when appropriate.

Screen Suffolk aims to hold quarterly monitoring meetings with the councils, and revisions to this document will form an agenda item at these meetings.

## **14. Fees and Charges**

- a. Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003 permits Local Authorities to charge for "discretionary services". Supporting filmmakers and film productions is considered a discretionary service. For the purposes of this document, this charge has been called the Film Service Charge.
- b. The level of the Film Service Charge has to be on a "cost recovery" basis only. The income arising from the Film Service Charge must not exceed the cost of the provision of the Film Service.
- c. Local Authorities are empowered to set charges as they see fit and may charge different persons different amounts or only charge some persons for the provision of the service.
- d. Screen Suffolk will provide a "menu" of services for which the Film Service Charge may apply:
  - i) Location searches and scouting
  - ii) Location hire fees (for council owned properties)
  - iii) Parking suspension fees
  - iv) Temp structure agreement (use of film equipment on the highways)
  - v) Site Visits
  - vi) Negotiating / producing contracts
  - vii) Liaising with the local community
  - viii) Liaising with other Council departments on behalf of the film production
  - ix) Liaising with external agencies including emergency services



- x) Arranging parking suspensions and dispensations.
  - xi) Arranging parking on uncontrolled highways
  - xii) Provision of TTRO and TTRN for filming on public highways
  - xiii) Health and safety advice and monitoring
  - xiv) Monitoring location filming
  - xv) Reinstatement checks
- e. Screen Suffolk will adopt a “price list” – which will be posted on the screen Suffolk website so that the level of charges are freely available to anyone who wishes to view them.
  - f. On receiving an application from a film producer Screen Suffolk will present an estimate of charges. The film producer should be informed of any change to the charge as the planning process progresses.
  - g. Parking charges should be levied at the same rate as any other customer
  - h. Council Owned Locations such as parks, housing estates, town halls and offices etc will be charged for at a commercial rate, to be determined by Screen Suffolk.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Forest Heath District Council

**Report No: CAB/FH/16/064**

## **Decisions Plan**

### **Key Decisions and other executive decisions to be considered**

**Date: 1 December 2016 to 31 May 2017**

**Publication Date: 14 November 2016**

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

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

Members of the public may wish to:

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

In all instances, contact should be made with the named Officer in the first instance, either on the telephone number listed against their name, or via email using the format [firstname.surname@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:firstname.surname@westsuffolk.gov.uk) or via Forest Heath District Council, District Offices, College Heath Road, Mildenhall, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP28 7EY.

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
	<p><b>West Suffolk Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA)</b></p> <p>This item has been removed from the Decisions Plan, as it has been determined that adoption of the GTAA is no longer required, but the document will provide an evidence base to support local planning policies.</p>				Sara Mildmay-White West Suffolk Lead for Housing 01359 270580 <a href="mailto:sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk">sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	Simon Phelan Head of Housing 01638 719440		
13/12/16 <i>(Deferred from 25/10/16)</i>	<p><b>Forest Heath Local Plan</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to consider the recommendations of the Local Plan Working Group in relation to Regulation 19 submission drafts of the Single Issue Review (SIR) and the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) for public consultation and submission for Examination.</p>	Not applicable	(R) - Council 21/12/16	Cabinet/ Council	Lance Stanbury Planning and Growth 07970 947704	Steven Wood Head of Planning and Growth 01284 757306	All Wards	Recommendations of the Local Plan Working Group to Cabinet and Council

<b>Expected Decision Date</b>	<b>Subject and Purpose of Decision</b>	<b>Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)</b>	<b>Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)</b>	<b>Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder Contact Details</b>	<b>Lead Officer Contact Details</b>	<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>Documents to be submitted</b>
13/12/16	<p><b>Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes 2017/2018</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to consider proposals for the Local Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Council Tax Technical Changes for 2017/2018, prior to seeking its approval by Council.</p>	Not applicable	(R) - Council 21/12/16	Cabinet/ Council	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Report to Cabinet, with recommendations to Council
13/12/16	<p><b>Council Tax Base for Tax Setting Purposes 2017/2018</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to recommend to full Council the basis of the formal calculation for the Council Tax Base for the financial year 2017/2018.</p>	Not applicable	(R) - Council 21/12/16	Cabinet/ Council	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Report to Cabinet, with recommendations to Council

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
13/12/16	<p><b>Applications for Community Chest Grant Funding 2017/2018</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to consider applications for the Community Chest funding for 2017/2018.</p>	Not applicable	(KD) - Applications for the 2018/2019 year and beyond are also subject to the budget setting process	Cabinet	Robin Millar Families and Communities 07939 100937	Davina Howes Head of Families and Communities 01284 757070	All Wards	Report to Cabinet
13/12/16 <i>(Deferred from 20/09/16)</i>	<p><b>Housing Development Company - Barley Homes (Group) Ltd - Initial Five Year Business Plan</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to make recommendations to full Council, in respect of approving funding to implement the initial five year Business Plan for the Council's wholly owned Housing Development Company: Barley Homes (Group) Ltd.</p>	Paragraph 3	(R) - Council 21/12/16	Cabinet/ Council	Sara Mildmay-White West Suffolk Lead for Housing 01359 270580 <a href="mailto:sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk">sara.mildmay-white@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Cabinet and Council

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
13/12/16 <i>(Deferred from 25/10/16)</i>	<b>Delivering a Sustainable Budget 2017/2018</b>  The Cabinet will be asked to consider recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee for recommending to Council on proposals for achieving a sustainable budget in 2017/2018.	Not applicable	(R) - Council 21/12/16	Cabinet/ Council	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Recommendations of the Performance and Audit Scrutiny Committee to Cabinet and Council
13/12/16	<b>Training Requirement for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Drivers</b>  The Cabinet will be asked to consider the recommendations of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee in respect of whether the relevant Business and Technology Education Council (BTEC) Level 2 Qualification should be required for all new and existing Hackney Carriage and Private Hire	Not applicable	(R) - Council 21/12/16	Cabinet/ Council	Lance Stanbury Planning and Growth 07970 947704	Steven Wood Head of Planning and Growth, 01284 757306  Amanda Garnham Licensing Team Leader 01284 757132	All Wards	Recommendations of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee to Cabinet and Council

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
	Vehicle Drivers in the District. This policy change will also be subject to full Council approval.							
13/12/16	<b>Location Filming in Suffolk</b>  The Cabinet will be asked to consider granting authority to Film Fixer Ltd (trading as Screen Suffolk) to act as the Council's agent for making location filming agreements in West Suffolk, as part of a county-wide scheme.	Not applicable	(KD)	Cabinet	Lance Stanbury Planning and Growth 07970 947704	Steven Wood Head of Planning and Growth 01284 757306  Andrea Mayley Service Manager (Economic Development and Growth) 01284 757343	All Wards	Report to Cabinet
14/02/17	<b>Revenues Collection and Performance Write-Offs</b>  The Cabinet will be asked to consider writing-off outstanding debts detailed in the exempt Appendices.	Paragraphs 1 and 2	(KD)	Cabinet	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Report to Cabinet, with exempt appendices



<b>Expected Decision Date</b>	<b>Subject and Purpose of Decision</b>	<b>Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)</b>	<b>Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)</b>	<b>Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder Contact Details</b>	<b>Lead Officer Contact Details</b>	<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>Documents to be submitted</b>
14/02/17	<p><b>Annual Treasury Management and Investment Strategy 2017/2018 and Treasury Management Code of Practice</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to recommend to Council the approval of the Treasury Management and Investment Strategy 2017/2018, which must be undertaken before the start of each financial year.</p>	Not applicable	(R) - Council 22/02/17	Cabinet/ Council	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Report to Cabinet, with recommendations to Council
14/02/17	<p><b>Budget and Council Tax Setting 2017/2018 and Medium Term Financial Strategy</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to consider the proposals for the 2017/2018 budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy, prior to its approval by Council. This report includes the Minimum Revenues</p>	Not applicable	(R) - Council 22/02/17	Cabinet/ Council	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Reports to Cabinet and Council

Expected Decision Date	Subject and Purpose of Decision	Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)	Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)	Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)	Portfolio Holder Contact Details	Lead Officer Contact Details	Wards Affected	Documents to be submitted
	Provision (MRP) Policy and Prudential Indicators.							
14/02/17	<p><b>Designated Public Place Orders in Brandon and Newmarket and Change to Public Space Protection Orders</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to give approval for going out to consultation on planned changes to the above Orders, as required by legislation. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may also be asked to consider the latter prior to seeking Cabinet approval.</p>	Not applicable	(D)	Cabinet	Robin Millar Families and Communities 07939 100937	Davina Howes Head of Families and Communities 01284 757070  Helen Lindfield Families and Communities Officer (Community Safety Lead) 01284 757620	All Saints; Brandon East; Brandon West; Severals; St Mary's	Report to Cabinet (which may include recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee), with map and proposed conditions.
14/02/17 <i>(Deferred from 13/12/16)</i>	<p><b>Mildenhall Hub: Business Case</b></p> <p>The Cabinet will be asked to consider and recommend to Council, the financial Business Case for the Mildenhall Hub Project.</p>	Paragraph 3	(R) - Council 22/02/17	Cabinet/ Council	James Waters Leader of the Council 07771 621038	Alex Wilson Director 01284 757695	Great Heath; Market	Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Cabinet and Council

<b>Expected Decision Date</b>	<b>Subject and Purpose of Decision</b>	<b>Reason for taking item in private (see Note 1 for relevant exempt paragraphs)</b>	<b>Decision (D), Key Decision (KD) or Rec (R) to Council on date  (see Note 2 for Key Decision definitions)</b>	<b>Decision Taker (see Note 3 for membership)</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder Contact Details</b>	<b>Lead Officer Contact Details</b>	<b>Wards Affected</b>	<b>Documents to be submitted</b>
04/04/17 <i>(Deferred from 01/11/16)</i>	<b>West Suffolk Information Strategy</b>  The Cabinet will be asked to consider the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and recommend to full Council, approval of a West Suffolk Information Strategy, which had been jointly produced with St Edmundsbury Borough Council.	Not applicable	Possibly (R) - Council 26/04/17	Cabinet/ Council	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Cabinet and Council
16/05/17	<b>Revenues Collection and Performance Write-Offs</b>  The Cabinet will be asked to consider writing-off outstanding debts detailed in the exempt Appendices.	Paragraphs 1 and 2	(KD)	Cabinet	Stephen Edwards Resources and Performance 01638 660518	Rachael Mann Head of Resources and Performance 01638 719245	All Wards	Report to Cabinet, with exempt appendices

**NOTE 1: DEFINITIONS OF EXEMPT INFORMATION: RELEVANT PARAGRAPHS**

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

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

PART 1

DESCRIPTIONS OF EXEMPT INFORMATION: ENGLAND

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

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

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

**NOTE 2: KEY DECISION DEFINITIONS**

Key decisions are:

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

**NOTE 3: MEMBERSHIP OF BODIES MAKING KEY DECISIONS**

**(a) Membership of the Cabinet and their Portfolios:**

<u>Cabinet Member</u>	<u>Portfolio</u>
James Waters	Leader of the Council;
Robin Millar	Deputy Leader of the Council; Families and Communities
David Bowman	Operations
Andy Drummond	Leisure and Culture
Stephen Edwards	Resources and Performance
Lance Stanbury	Planning and Growth

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

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

Karen Points  
 Head of HR, Legal and Democratic Services  
 Date: 14 November 2016