

# (Extraordinary) Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee

Forest Heath &amp; St Edmundsbury councils

**West Suffolk**  
working together

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Agenda</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Wednesday 20 March 2019</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	<b>2.30 pm    **NOTE TIME OF MEETING**</b>	
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Training Centre District Offices</b> College Heath Road Mildenhall IP28 7EY	
	<b>**Please note that this meeting will only be held if the Forest Heath District Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at their meeting on Thursday 14 March 2019, makes alternative recommendations which will need to be considered by the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee (see Agenda Item 4. overleaf**</b>	
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chairman</b> James Waters</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Vice-Chairman</b> John Griffiths</p>	
<u>Forest Heath DC</u>	<p><b>Councillor</b></p> David Bowman Ruth Bowman J.P. Andy Drummond Stephen Edwards Robin Millar  Lance Stanbury James Waters	<p><b>Portfolio</b></p> Operations Future Governance Leisure and Culture Resources and Performance Deputy Leader/Families and Communities Planning and Growth Leader
<u>St Edmundsbury BC</u>	Carol Bull Robert Everitt Susan Glossop John Griffiths Ian Houlder Sara Mildmay-White  Jo Rayner Peter Stevens	Future Governance Families and Communities Planning and Growth Leader Resources and Performance Deputy Leader/Housing/West Suffolk Lead for Housing Leisure and Culture Operations
<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>	Six Members, to include at least three of the total number of Members of each Cabinet.	

<b>Committee administrator:</b>	<b>Sharon Turner</b> Democratic Services Officer <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 & St Edmundsbury councils

## West Suffolk

working together

<b>Venue:</b>	<b>District Offices</b> <b>College Heath Road</b> Mildenhall Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP28 7EY	Tel: 01638 719237 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 and following address:  <b>West Suffolk House</b> Western Way Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP33 3YU at least five clear days before the meeting. They are also available to view on our website.	
<b>Attendance at meetings:</b>	The West Suffolk Councils 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 participation:</b>	Members of the public who live or work in the Borough/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.	
<b>Personal Information</b>	Any personal information processed by Forest Heath District Council or St Edmundsbury Borough Council arising from a request to speak at a public meeting under the Localism Act 2011, will be protected in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. For more information on how we do this and your rights in regards to your personal information and how to access it, visit our website: <a href="https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/Council/Data_and_information/howweuseinformation.cfm">https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/Council/Data_and_information/howweuseinformation.cfm</a> or call Customer Services: 01284 763233 and ask to speak to the Data Protection Officer.	

# Agenda

## Procedural Matters

### 1. Apologies for Absence

#### Part 1 - Public

### 2. Open Forum

At each Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee 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.

### 3. Public Participation

Members of the public who live or work in the Borough/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.

#### NON-KEY DECISIONS

### 4. **FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee Call-in of Decision of FHDC/SEBC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth: Future High Street Fund**

1 - 22

***This item will only be required if the Forest Heath District Council (FHDC) Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at their meeting on Thursday 14 March 2019, makes alternative recommendations which will need to be considered by the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee.***

***Any alternative recommendations will be circulated to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee following the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on Thursday 14 March 2019.***

Report No: **CAB/JT/19/019**

Portfolio Holders: SEBC Cllr Susan Glossop and

FHDC Cllr Lance Stanbury

Lead Officers: Julie Baird and Christine Brain

**Part 2 – Exempt**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

# (Extraordinary) Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee



<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee Call-in of Decision of FHDC/SEBC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth: Future High Street Fund</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/JT/19/019</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	14 March 2019
	<b>(Extraordinary) Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee</b>	20 March 2019
<b>Portfolio holders:</b>	Cllr Susan Glossop SEBC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07473 041394 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk">susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	Cllr Lance Stanbury FHDC 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>	Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757613 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk">julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	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>To consider the alternative recommendations made by the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 14 March 2019, in relation to the submission of an expression of interest for Haverhill in Round One of the Future High Street Fund.</p> <p>These alternative recommendations will be circulated to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee following the meeting of the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Thursday 14 March 2019.</p>	

**Recommendation:** It is **RECOMMENDED** that the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee consider the alternative recommendations from the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee and determine whether to:

(1) Amend the decision made by the SEBC and FHDC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth on 27 February 2019, in relation to the submission of an expression of interest in Round One of the Future High Street Fund.

**OR**

(2) Confirm the decision made by the SEBC and FHDC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth on 27 February 2019, this being:

*'That the submission of an expression of interest in Round One of the Future High Street Fund, as set out in paragraph 2.1.4 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008, be approved'.*

**Key Decision:** *Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?*  
 (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that **do not** apply.)  
 Yes, it is a Key Decision -   
 No, it is not a Key Decision -

*The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within 48 hours.*

**Consultation:** • As set out in attached Appendix

**Alternative option(s):** • As set out in attached Appendix

**Implications:**

Are there any **financial** implications? Yes  No   
 If yes, please give details • As set out in attached Appendix

Are there any **staffing** implications? Yes  No   
 If yes, please give details • As set out in attached Appendix

Are there any **ICT** implications? If yes, please give details Yes  No   
 • As set out in attached Appendix

Are there any **legal and/or policy** implications? If yes, please give details Yes  No   
 • As set out in attached Appendix

Are there any **equality** implications? Yes  No   
 If yes, please give details • As set out in attached Appendix

**Risk/opportunity assessment:** *(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)*

Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
As set out in attached Appendix			



<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	All
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	Press release by the MHCLG on 26 December 2018: <a href="#">£675m Fund to Transform High Streets</a>
<b>Documents attached:</b>	<b>Appendix:</b> FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 14 March 2019: Report No: OAS/FH/19/006 and associated Appendices

---

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

### **1.1 Heading**

- 1.1.1 In line with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules, as contained within Part 4 of the FHDC Constitution, five FHDC Councillors have 'called-in' the decision made by the SEBC and FHDC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth on 27 February 2019, on the submission of an expression of interest for Haverhill in Round One of the Future High Street Fund.
- 1.1.2 This call-in will be considered by the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on Thursday 14 March 2019, as an urgent item. Attached to this report are the papers which have been circulated to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 1.1.3 If at their meeting on Thursday 14 March 2019, the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee agrees with the called-in decision, then the decision will be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting and no further consideration will need to be taken by the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee.
- 1.1.4 However, if the FHDC Overview and Scrutiny Committee makes alternative recommendations these will need to be considered by the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee. As this agenda has been issued prior to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Thursday 14 March 2019, any alternative recommendations made by the Committee will then be circulated to the Cabinet Members, following that meeting.

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee



<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Call-In Future High Street Fund</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>OAS/FH/19/006</b>	
<b>Report to and date:</b>	<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b>	14 March 2019
<b>Portfolio Holders:</b>	<p>Councillor Lance Stanbury FHDC 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></p> <p>Councillor Susan Glossop SEBC Portfolio Holder Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07473 041394 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk">susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk</a></p>	
<b>Lead officers:</b>	<p>Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757613 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk">julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a></p> <p>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></p>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To investigate the called-in decision relating to the Portfolio Holders Decision Notice regarding " <i>the submission of an expression of interest in round one of the Future High Street Fund</i> ", published on 28 February 2019.	
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p><b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee is requested to either:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1) Allow the decision to be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting; or</b></li> <li><b>2) Refer the decision back to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee with alternative recommendations from the Forest Heath Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</b></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>		• N/A	
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>		• N/A	
<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"/> •	
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> •	
<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)
	Low/Medium/ High*		Low/Medium/ High*
None			
<b>Wards affected:</b>		All	
<b>Background papers:</b>		Press release by the MHCLG on 26 December 2018: <a href="#">£675 Fund to Transform High Streets</a>	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		<b>Appendix 1</b> – Completed Call-In Request Form  <b>Appendix 2</b> – Portfolio Holder’s Decisions Notice – 28 February 2019 - <b>Attached</b>  <b>Appendix 3</b> – Portfolio Holder’s Report – 27 February 2019 - <b>Attached</b>  <b>Appendix 4</b> – Call-In Meeting General Guidance Notes	

## Key issues and reasons for recommendation

### 1. Call-In Request

- 1.1 In line with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules, as contained within Part 4 of the FHDC Constitution, Councillor Victor Lukaniuk, with the support of Councillors Andrew Appleby, Christine Mason, David Palmer and Peter Ridgwell has called-in the Portfolio Holders decision notice published on 28 February 2019, in respect of the "Future High Street Fund".

The call-in has been actioned under items 1 and 8 of the principles for decision making, as follows:

- We in Brandon were not given the opportunity to make a case for funding; and
- The process was flawed.

The reasons given for the call-in are as set out in the Call-in Notice, attached as **Appendix 1** to this report.

### 2. Background

- 2.1 On 26 December 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued a press release setting out details of a "*£675 million fund to transform high streets and town centres opens to communities*", which was made available to all members as a policy alert.
- 2.2 On 19 February 2019, an intention to make a decision was published both on the Councils website and Intranet by the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth as follows:

*The Forest Heath DC and St Edmundsbury BC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth will be asked to consider approving a submission of an Expression of Interest in round one of the MHCLG's Future High Street Fund. The objective of this Fund, which comprises a total allocation of £675m is to "renew and reshape town centres and high streets in a way that improves experience, drives growth and ensures future sustainability".*

*Other options would be considered later when the second round of bidding opens. In the current round, local authorities can bid for up to £25m. The submission will be made to MHCLG, who will then shortlist bids to be put forward to a second round of bidding, which will require production of a full business case. Expressions of Interest must be submitted by 22 March 2019.*

*In making their decision, the Portfolio Holders will need to consider a number of options, the wider strategic context, and which preferred option would be best placed at this time to meet the stringent criteria set by Central Government.*

- 2.3 On 28 February 2019, a Portfolio Holders Decisions Notice, attached at (**Appendix 2**) was published setting out the reasons for the decision and other options considered.

Published alongside the Decisions Notice, was a supporting Portfolio Holder's Report, **CAB/JT/19/008**, attached at (**Appendix 3**).

**3. Call-In Meeting General Guidance Notes**

- 3.1 Attached at **Appendix 4** to this report are guidance notes on how the call-in meeting will be conducted by the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**4. Proposals**

- 4.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is requested to either:
- 1) Allow the decision to be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting; or
  - 2) Refer the decision back to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee with alternative recommendations from the Forest Heath Overview and Scrutiny Committee.



Forest Heath  
District Council

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
CALL-IN REQUEST FORM**



St Edmundsbury  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

To: Assistant Director (HR, Legal and Democratic Services)

I would like to call-in the decision as detailed below:

Decision making body (Cabinet or Portfolio Holder)

Date decision made:

PLANNING AND GROWTH  
CLLR GLOSSOP CLLR STANBURY

28th FEB. 2019

What was the Decision made by Cabinet or Portfolio Holder:

THAT HAVERHILL BE THE APPLICANT  
FOR THE "HIGH STREET FUND"

If the reason for the call-in is that the decision was outside the Budget Policy Framework Procedure Rules, please give an explanation

WE IN BRANDON WERE NOT GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY  
TO MAKE A CASE FOR FUNDING.  
THE PROCESS WAS FLAWED

What action would you like to see the Cabinet / Portfolio Holder take to address the concerns outlined in the call-in, or what needs to be done to strengthen their decision?

TO REVERSE THE DECISION BECAUSE OF BRANDON'S  
GREATER NEEDS

At what stage did you inform the Portfolio Holder or the Leader of the Council that you had concerns over this planned decision? If not a planned decision (that is if the decision did not appear on the Decisions Plan), what attempts did you make to speak to the Portfolio Holder before calling in the decision?

I INFORMED THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS ON THE 27th FEB  
AND RECEIVED A REPLY FROM CLLR GLOSSOP 2nd MARCH  
INFORMING ME THAT JONATHAN MILES (GROWTH OFFICER)  
WOULD BE GIVING ME AN EXPLANATION, WHICH I  
WAS UNHAPPY WITH, I WANT A REPLY FROM CLLR STANBURY

I HAVE HAD A REPLY FROM COUNCILLOR STANBURY  
BUT IT FALLS SHORT OF EXPECTATIONS

**Please state which of the principles for decision making set out in Article 12 of the Constitution has / have been breached (please tick)**

		TICK
1	The decision was not reasonable within the common meaning of the word, ie it was not a rational decision based on sound judgement.	✓
2	The decision was not reasonable within the legal meaning of "reasonableness", ie all relevant considerations were not fully taken into account in reaching the decision and all irrelevant ones disregarded.	
3	In the case of 'quasi-judicial' decisions (ie a decision as to whether or not to grant a licence) a fair hearing was not conducted in accordance with the rules of natural justice to the person who was the subject of the decision.	
4	The decision was not proportionate (ie the action was not proportionate to the desired outcome).	
5	The decision was not taken on the basis of due consultation and professional advice from officers.	
6	Human rights were not respected and consideration was not given as to whether the decision would give rise to any implications under the Human Rights Act 1998 and the European Convention on Human Rights.	
7	The decision was not taken in compliance with Council's schemes of delegation, financial rules and instructions relating to contracts.	
8	When making the decision, a presumption in favour of openness was not applied and a clarity of aims and desired outcomes was not displayed.	✓
9	Careful consideration was not given as to whether there was an interest that should have been declared.	
10	In the case of an executive decision taken by the Cabinet, or an individual Member of the Cabinet, or an Officer (where the decision is closely connected with the Cabinet), a proper record of the decision was not made together with a record of the reasons for the decision, details of any alternative options considered and rejected and any conflicts of interest.	

**Referring to the box(es) ticked above, please explain how the principles set out in Article 12 of the Constitution have not been met, and provide documentation or evidence, where appropriate to support the call-in:**

WE WERE NOT CONSULTED AND OUR NEEDS WERE NOT FULLY CONSIDERED WHEN THE DECISION WAS MADE TO EXCLUDE US FROM THE APPLICATION. THERE IS A COMPLETE ABSENCE OF DOCUMENTATION TO SUGGEST THAT OUR NEEDS WERE FULLY EXPLAINED TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS.

**Suggested Witnesses (Internal / External) to be invited and their relevance to the call-in**

N/A



**Members calling in the decision** (Call-in to be requested by any five members of the Council)

	Name of Councillor	Signed	Will you be attending the call-in meeting?
1	(Lead on Call-in) VICTOR LUKANIUK	<i>V. Lukaniuk</i>	YES.
2	CLLR PETER RICHARD RICHWELL	<del><i>[Signature]</i></del>	
3	DAVID PALMER	<i>DP</i>	Yes.
4	CHRISTINE MASON	<i>C Mason</i>	Yes.
5	CLLR ANDREW APPLEBY	VIA E-MAIL	yes.

Once completed, either by hand or electronically, please send to the Assistant Direct (HR, Legal and Democratic Services) **BY 5PM ON THE DEADLINE DATE PUBLISHED ON THE CABINET DECISION NOTICE**, otherwise the call-in will not be valid.

Amended: March 2015 (Constitutional Review)  
Amended: November 2017 (Amendment made to Job Title)

Received on Thursday 7 March 2019, at 2-30pm.

CABIN  
Scrutiny officer.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Forest Heath District Council  
St Edmundsbury Borough Council**  
Portfolio Holder Decisions Notice  
(Published: Thursday 28 February 2019)

The following decision was taken by the Forest Heath District and St Edmundsbury Borough Councils' Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth on **Wednesday 27 February 2019** and, if not called in by Councillors, will come into operation on Friday 8 March 2019. An executive decision may be called in, in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Procedure Rules contained within Part 4 of each Council's Constitutions, by at least five Councillors submitting the required call-in request form to the Assistant Director (HR, Legal and Democratic Services) (e-mail: [democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk)) **by 5.00 pm on Thursday 7 March 2019.**

Should you have a query regarding any of the decisions taken, 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). Alternatively, you may also contact the relevant Portfolio Holder on the telephone number listed against their name, or via email using the format [firstname.surname@stedsbc.gov.uk](mailto:firstname.surname@stedsbc.gov.uk) or [firstname.surname@forest-heath.gov.uk](mailto:firstname.surname@forest-heath.gov.uk) Contact may also be made via Democratic Services, West Suffolk House, Western Way, Bury St Edmunds Suffolk, IP33 3YU

Page 13

Agenda Item and Report No.	Declarations of Interest/Dispensations Granted	Decision(s) (including recommendations to Council)	Reason(s) for Decision(s)	Other Options Considered and Reasons for Rejection	Contacts
No Agenda Item No. as PH Decision  Report No: CAB/JT/19/008	None	<u>Future High Street Fund</u>  RESOLVED:  That the submission of an expression of interest in round one of the Future High Street Fund, as set out in paragraph 2.1.4 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008, be approved.	Bearing in mind the fact that whichever town West Suffolk chose to bid for the Future High Street Fund would be in competition with other towns across the whole of England and Wales, it is important to choose the town that has the best fit with the stated criteria (as summarised in Report No: CAB/JT/19/008).  Whilst several other West Suffolk towns showed that they have challenges similar to Haverhill such as a poor range of shops and poor range of town centre uses, it was	Options under consideration and rejected for the reasons given accordingly are set out in Section 2 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008.	<u>Portfolio Holders:</u> SEBC Cllr Susan Glossop 07473 041394  FHDC Cllr Lance Stanbury 07970 947704  <u>Officer:</u> Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) 01284 757613

Agenda Item and Report No.	Declarations of Interest/Dispensations Granted	Decision(s) (including recommendations to Council)	Reason(s) for Decision(s)	Other Options Considered and Reasons for Rejection	Contacts
			<p>the opportunities in Haverhill that set it apart.</p> <p>The Government has stated that it proposes to open a second round of funding in the future and consideration was given to whether to submit two bids in round one. The amount of work that goes into writing an expression of interest is however, more extensive than may be thought, particularly with this fund which is very reliant upon support from stakeholders. It is considered that to ask stakeholders to support two bids at the same time would devalue the support. The preference of the Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth is therefore, for a strong bid to be submitted in this round for Haverhill and then the same effort can be given to a second town in round two.</p>		

Leah Mickleborough  
Service Manager (Democratic Services) and Monitoring Officer  
28 February 2019

# Portfolio Holders

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Future High Street Fund</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/JT/19/008</b>	
<b>Report to / date of decision:</b>	<b>Portfolio Holders' Decision</b>	27 February 2019
<b>Portfolio Holders:</b>	Lance Stanbury FHDC 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>	Susan Glossop SEBC Portfolio Holder Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07473 041394 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk">susan.glossop@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Julie Baird Assistant Director (Growth) <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757613 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk">julie.baird@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To agree the submission of an Expression Of Interest for Haverhill in round one of the Future High Street Fund. The deadline for the submissions is 22 March 2019.	
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>It is RECOMMENDED that the FHDC and SEBC Portfolio Holders for Planning and Growth approve the submission of an expression of interest in round one of the Future High Street Fund, as set out in paragraph 2.1.4 of Report No: CAB/JT/19/008.</b>	
<b>Key Decision:</b>  (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)	<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>	
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.		
<b>Consultation:</b>	•	

<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options under consideration are set out in Section 2 below.</li> </ul>		
<b>Implications:</b>			
Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? <i>If yes, please give details</i>		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b>		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
<b>Risk area</b>	<b>Inherent level of risk</b> (before controls)	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)
The expression of interest is not successful	Med	Adhere to the guidance given with the fund; and encourage a wide range of stakeholders to support our case.	Low
Local Haverhill businesses are not supportive of the Expression of Interest	Low	Ensure the benefits of the fund are adequately explained	Low
Local Haverhill businesses, residents and stakeholders expect the expression of interest to include a wider range of elements than would be practicable/possible	Medium	Explanation of the fund; its purpose; the competitive nature; and the likely level of funds if successful.	Low
Local residents and or stakeholders from other towns raise concern at the election of Haverhill as a subject for the Expression of Interest	High	Explanation that the fund is competitive and fairly prescriptive about the elements one should include. Explanation that a thorough assessment has been undertaken to assess which of our towns would be most likely to secure funding.	Medium
<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>		N/A	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## **1. Background to Future High Street Fund**

### **1.1 Background**

1.1.1 MCHLG has allocated £675m into a fund to support the High Street. The objective of the Future High Street Fund (FHSF) is to **renew and reshape town centres and high streets in a way that improves experience, drives growth and ensures future sustainability.**

1.1.2 The fund sets out the themes under which it is expected any identified need for investment will fall. These are as follows:

- Investment in physical infrastructure
- Acquisition and assembly of land including to support new housing, workspaces and public realm
- Improvements to transport access, traffic flow and circulation in the area
- Supporting change of use including (where appropriate) housing delivery and densification
- Supporting adaptation of the high street in response to changing technology

1.1.3 MCHLG has allocated £55m of the Fund to the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport to support the regeneration of heritage high streets. The precise details of this element of the fund have not been set out as yet.

1.1.4 The FHSF will work as follows:

- There will be two rounds of the Fund, both with a two-phase application process
- Phase 1 of application process is an Expression of Interest stage where places will be assessed on the need for funding, nature of the challenge and the vision for the future of the town centre
- Phase 2 of application process is for those who pass to Phase 2, there will be an amount of revenue funding available to work up project proposals. Funding decisions will be based on project plans and business cases.
- In the first round of the Fund, projects which are 'shovel ready' may be fast-tracked for funding.
- An announcement on the second round of the Fund is expected soon.
- It is expected that projects will be co-funded by public and private sector stakeholders and this will be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of projects.
- The Fund will contribute up to a maximum of £25 million to each successful place. However, MCHLG has stated that it expects to see a range of project sizes coming forward, many of which are in the region of £5-10 million per town centre.

1.1.5 The fund will run to the following timetable:

- **December 2018:** Phase 1 opens and Expressions of Interest invited
- **22 March 2019:** deadline for Expressions of Interest
- **Summer 2019:** announcement on places moving to Phase 2
- **Late 2019:** first round of final business cases to be submitted
- **Spring 2020:** all remaining final business cases to be submitted
- **Not before 2020:** Second round of applications opens

1.1.6 Other points to note:

- MCHLG has stated that it will not accept bids covering town centre areas that are not facing significant challenges.
- MCHLG originally stated that it expected local authorities to put forward a single, transformative submission covering one high street or town centre in their area; however this has now been changed. It is now possible for Local Authorities to submit multiple bids depending upon their size. West Suffolk can put in two bids, however it doesn't have to be both in the same round.

## 1.2 **Haverhill**

1.2.1 All five towns, Brandon, Bury St Edmunds, Haverhill, Mildenhall and Newmarket were assessed against the same criteria which included:

- Proportion and/or number of vacant properties
- Openings/closures of commercial units (Nov17 – Nov18)
- Proportion of Independents
- Average rental value (per sq ft per annum)
- Changes to residential (A1 – C3)
- Diversity of uses in the town centre area
- Out Commuting (% 16-74 in employment travelling over 20km to work)
- Resident/customer surveys
- Pedestrian flows and footfall trends
- Volume & Value report, 2015
- Air Quality
- Environmental factors
- Perception of safety and occurrence of crime
- Housing demands
- Ambition and Opportunities
- Innovation
- VENUESCORE (2014-2015) VENUESCORE™ is an annual survey compiled by Javelin Group, which ranks the UK's top 3,500+ retail venues (including town centres, stand-alone malls, retail warehouse parks and factory outlet centres).

1.2.2 Bearing in mind the fact that whichever town we choose to bid for would be in competition with other towns across the whole of England and Wales, it is important to choose the town that has the best fit with the stated criteria.



- 1.2.3 Whilst several other towns showed that they have challenges similar to Haverhill such as a poor range of shops and poor range of town centre uses, it was the opportunities in Haverhill that set it apart.
- 1.2.4 It will be possible for the Expression of Interest to be written to show the extent of the challenge in Haverhill set against the potential to fund initiatives that can change the fortune of the town centre. If successful and if transferable, it will be possible (subject to future funding) for other towns to benefit from the initiatives piloted in Haverhill (if the bid to the FHSF is successful).
- 1.2.5 Regardless of whether the bid to the FHSF is successful or not, it is a stated ambition of West Suffolk that its market towns should be supported and promoted. To this end, there are a number of projects that are currently being worked on in each of the towns. For example, Brandon Leisure Centre improvements; 17/18 Cornhill redevelopment, Bury St Edmunds; Mildenhall Hub; and Newmarket High Street Design work.

## **2. Options for consideration**

- 2.1.1 Three options have been considered to make the most of the Future High Street Fund opportunity.
- 2.1.2 Do nothing: This option was quickly discounted as to not apply for funding would definitely result in no funding coming forward. The only benefit to this option is that some time and effort is saved.
- 2.1.3 Choose a different town: It was important to consider which of the towns would give West Suffolk the greatest chance of success. This was a different consideration to the question, which of our High Streets would we most like to have funding to spend in.
- 2.1.4 Bid for more than one town: Up until very recently, to submit for more than one town per local authority area was against the rules of the fund. However, it is now possible that West Suffolk could submit a second Expression of Interest for another town. It is considered that this option is still available to us as the government has stated that it proposes to open a second round of funding in the future. The consideration was therefore, whether to submit two bids in round one. The amount of work that goes into writing an expression of interest is more extensive than may be thought. Particularly with this fund which is very reliant upon support from stakeholders. It is considered that to ask stakeholders to support two bids at the same time would devalue the support. The preference therefore is for a strong bid to be submitted in this round for Haverhill and then the same effort can be given to a second town in round two.

This page is intentionally left blank

### **CALL-IN MEETING GENERAL GUIDANCE NOTES**

**Description:** guidance for members on conducting a call-in meeting, and steps taken once a decision has been made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

- 1) The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will introduce the call-in, and indicate who is to speak in support of the decision, and who will be the main spokesperson for the Call-In Members.
- 2) The lead call-in member who requested the call-in will then outline to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee their reasons/concerns, making reference to the principles of decision making.
- 3) The decision maker and (supporting officers) to respond to the points raised by the lead call-in member, making reference to the principles of decision making.
- 4) Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to discuss the evidence presented, and will ask the lead call-in member and the decision maker questions.
- 5) The call-in member and decision maker will then briefly sum up/give a closing statement.
- 6) The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will debate the decision and the reasons for the call-in and make recommendations to either:
  - i) Allow the decision to be implemented immediately following the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting; or
  - ii) Refer the decision back to the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee with alternative recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 7) The decision to refer a matter for reconsideration by the Joint Executive (Cabinet) Committee must be taken by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the basis of a simple majority vote.

This page is intentionally left blank