

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Tuesday 2 September 2014 at 6.30pm.

Present:

Councillor Owen Bierley (Chairman) (In the Chair)
Councillor Gillian Bardsley (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Lewis Strange (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor David Dobbie
Councillor Richy Doran
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
Councillor Jessie Milne
Councillor Malcolm Parish
Councillor Irmgard Parrott
Councillor Di Rodgers
Councillor Lesley Rollings
Councillor Trevor Young

In Attendance :

Mark Sturgess	Chief Operating Officer
Alan Robinson	Head of Central Services
Jo Riddell	Head of Localism
Suzanne Fysh	Head of Development and Neighbourhoods
Sue Leversedge	Principal Accountant
Wendy Osgodby	Senior Growth Strategy Projects Officer
Gary Reeve	Team Manager Property and Assets
Kate Hearn	Community Action Officer – Community Safety
Dinah Lilley	Governance and Civic Officer

Also Present: Councillor Geoff Wiseman

30 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

31 MINUTES

(a) Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee – 15 July 2014

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on 15 July 2014 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

32 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE SETTING OUT THE CURRENT POSITION OF PREVIOUSLY AGREED ACTIONS AS AT 22 AUGUST 2014 (PRCC.14 14/15)

Members gave consideration to the Matters Arising Schedule which set out the current position of all previously agreed actions as at 22 August 2014.

The Governance and Civic Officer informed Members that the first two green items were not yet due for completion, the Growth Strategy and Growth Fund items had been updated and would show as completed for the next meeting. The Head of Development and Neighbourhoods informed Members that with regard to the GTAA, there was no change at present – and this was to be part of the SHMA in the Local Plan, currently out for consultation.

RESOLVED that progress on the Matters Arising Schedule, as set out in report PRCC.14 14/15 be received and noted.

33 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this point of the meeting.

34 GAINSBOROUGH MASTERPLAN REFRESH (PRCC.15 14/15)

The Senior Growth Strategy Projects Officer outlined the background to the report noting that Gainsborough Regained – The Masterplan had been published in summer 2007 and set out a clear signal of intent both locally and regionally, for the growth and regeneration of the town, aspiring to double the size of the population within 25 years.

The successes of the Masterplan were outlined, however the document was now six years old and in need of a 'refresh'. It predated some significant developments and was prepared during a very different economic climate. There was a need to create a new, ambitious but realistic document that could be used by decision makers and respond to the issues faced by businesses and the community of Gainsborough in 2014.

A refreshed Masterplan would assist in articulating the vision for Gainsborough and would provide an important tool to help secure new investment and development in the town.

The Senior Growth Strategy Projects Officer noted that a link had been sent to all Members, and proceeded to demonstrate the website that had been created. The next steps would be the launch of the site along with the Gainsborough Growth Fund at the LEP Summit on 24 October at the Epic

Centre. Following this the site would be promoted under the Inward Investment Marketing Programme which was in the development stages.

Members congratulated the Senior Growth Strategy Projects Officer on the site and its content and made suggestions for inclusion and minor improvements. The recommendations were moved, seconded and voted upon.

RESOLVED that:

- a) the content of the new interactive web-based Masterplan tool be agreed; and
- b) the Masterplan site be adopted and launched at the LEP Summit in October and go live following this.

35 RDPE FUNDING REPORT (PRCC.16 14/15)

The Senior Growth Strategy Projects Officer set out the background to the LEADER project and the RDPE funding, and outlined its success in the last programme of grant funding (2007-13) in which £4.5m of grant funding was awarded to the three Lincolnshire specific Local Action areas. The Lindsey Action Zone (LAZ) was awarded £2million for the last programme. Using the number of wards as an indication West Lindsey had approximately 25% of coverage across the programme area.

The total LAZ grant claimed in West Lindsey £793K and utilised across 15 projects which were set out in the report. The West Lindsey contribution of £50K helped lever in £1.531M into the area. For each £1 West Lindsey Contributed this generated £30.62. A number of case studies were listed in the report and further details were available on request.

Access to the next round of LEADER funding in the next Rural Development programme 2014-2020, which would have a much greater focus on supporting rural jobs and growth, was now being planned. Nearly 5%, approximately £139m, of the overall European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) would be used to support LEADER activities across the country and the funding could only be used in rural areas.

The new RDPE would cover a greater area than the last programme, it was envisaged that all of West Lindsey would have coverage in the new programme. With this increased coverage for the district it was proposed that the financial support package be increased. With the last programme West Lindsey provided £10,000 per year for the five years of the project and for 2015-2020 it was suggested that the contribution be up to £15,000 per year for the five years.

Note: Councillor Dobbie arrived at this point of the meeting.

Members of the Committee were enthusiastic about the programme and agreed that it was important to promote availability of the funding around the District and discussed various ways of achieving this.

The Chief Operating Officer noted that a Communications Plan for the programme would be submitted to a Committee Chair's briefing.

After being moved and seconded the recommendations were then voted upon.

RESOLVED that:

- a) the success of the last RDPE programme be acknowledged; and
- b) the proposal for West Lindsey District Council to support the next RDPE programme with up to £15,000 per year for five years commencing 2015, be supported, subject to approval by Policy and Resources Committee through the budget setting process for 2015/16.

36 REFORM OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR POWERS (PRCC.17 14/15)

The Head of Localism and the Community Action Officer - Community Safety introduced the report which set out changes likely to affect the Council under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, and sought approval for recommendations made for the implementation and management of new powers under the said Act.

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act was given Royal Assent on 13 March 2014. The Act had rewritten much of the legislation currently in use by local authorities for dealing with matters of anti-social behaviour, environmental crime and other enforcement. The new legislation came into force on 20 October 2014.

A list of the functions that would be affected by the new legislation was set out in the report. The new legislation included Civil Injunction; Criminal Behaviour Order; Community Protection Notice (CPN); Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) and Closure Power, and a description of each was listed at paragraph 2 of the report. Some offences merited positive action rather than sanctions in an attempt to encourage changes in behaviour.

From a review of the legislation it had been noted that changes in the constitution would be required to allow for delegation to appropriate officers. Failure to delegate powers prior to the Act coming in to force could leave the council open to legal challenge or damage the councils' reputation by leaving officers unable to use the legislation to tackle anti-social behaviour. It was recommended that the Licencing and Regulatory Committee be the responsible body for the granting of PSPOs, and that this function be added to

its Terms of Reference.

Members expressed concerns at the perceived lack of public confidence in the bureaucracy involved in dealing with anti-social behaviour, and agreed that a message needed to be widely disseminated as to which authorities were responsible for which problems and what could be done to address them. The public needed to be made aware that incidents had to be reported for action to be taken. It was requested that information on responsible authorities be circulated to Members.

The recommendations were then moved, seconded and voted upon.

RESOLVED that:

- a) the amendments to the constitution as detailed in Section 3(a) and Section 3(c) be recommended to full council for approval;
- b) the use of fixed penalties as detailed in Section 3(b) be recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee for approval; and
- c) the amended charging schedule for fixed penalty notices, as detailed in Section 3(b), be recommend to the Policy and Resources Committee, as part of the budget setting Process, for adoption with effect from 1 April 2015.

37 THE PROVISION OF WARDENS IN SHELTERED ACCOMMODATION (PRCC.18 14/15)

The Head of Central Services presented the report, following the resolution of Council on 28 April 2014 to update members on the progress made investigating how the change from resident wardens in Acis sheltered accommodation in the District to travelling Housing Support Assistants had affected residents and to assess whether there was a role for West Lindsey District Council in augmenting this provision.

The recommendation in the report was that officers continued to monitor the services (Acis Travelling Housing Support Assistants and support through the Well Being Service operated by the Lincolnshire County Council) that had replaced resident wardens in Acis sheltered accommodation and a further report on the options available to this council be brought to the Prosperous Communities Community once a full year's monitoring information on the new provision was available.

Officers had met with key stakeholders including Acis Group Ltd, Lincolnshire County Council and service providers as well as internal stakeholders and councillors to build knowledge and understanding of the changes and impact of the changes on residents. Any intervention in this service would need to be clearly based on evidence and agreed with the organisation responsible for the provision of the sheltered accommodation.

The responsibilities of the service at the nine housing schemes were set out in the report. Since the introduction of the new arrangements ACIS reported that two tenants had expressed a desire to move from the schemes due to the removal of scheduled daily visits. This equated to less than 1% of the tenants expressing any discomfort with the new arrangements. Therefore as far as the provider was concerned there were no issues emerging so far with the operation of the new service.

Note Councillor Doran declared a non-pecuniary interest at this point as he planned to attend the ACIS AGM.

Note Councillor Milne declared a non-pecuniary interest at this point as being a Council representative the ACIS management board.

Note Councillor Bierley declared a non-pecuniary interest at this point as being the Council's representative for Age UK Lindsey.

Councillor Mrs Rodgers refuted the evidence in the report, stating that it was not a true picture of residents' satisfaction with the service. Councillor Mrs Rodgers went on to describe several examples of residents' concerns and also told of a meeting which had been arranged which ended up being held in a pub car park. Residents were depressed and fearful, and some wanted to leave. A year was too long to wait for a review of the service.

Other Members of the Committee, and at the Chairman's invitation, Councillor Wiseman, spoke on the matter, stating that vulnerable people needed support and protection and that many felt abandoned. Residents deserved a decent level of service.

Concerns were also raised regarding other West Lindsey users of the Well Being Service, however it was suggested that this was a wider issue and the specific matter at hand was the warden service at ACIS schemes. Other matters could perhaps be given consideration by the Challenge and Improvement Committee in a review of health and wellbeing provision.

It was acknowledged that West Lindsey District Council was not the direct provider of the service, however as community leaders there was a responsibility to influence the appropriate agencies to provide the right level of support. It was moved that officers write to each individual resident, providing a stamped addressed envelope for response, and emphasise confidentiality, to gauge their level of dissatisfaction, or otherwise, with the service provided. It was also proposed that the report to feed back on the responses received be presented to the Committee within six months and not wait a year.

On the revised motion being seconded and voted upon it was:

RESOLVED: that further information on the service provided for residents in ACIS sheltered housing be gathered through a

structured letter sent to all residents of the schemes (a s.a.e. to be provided to all residents and confidentiality be assured), and a report to be brought back to the Prosperous Communities Committee within six months outlining the options available.

38 TOURISM WORKING GROUP – RECOMMENDATION FROM THE CHALLENGE AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE (PRCC.19 14/15)

The Senior Growth Strategy Projects Officer informed the Committee that over the last two years, the Challenge and Improvement Committee Tourism Working Group had been reviewing activity underway related to tourism in West Lindsey with a focus on 'creating local wealth through the visitor economy'. There was strong consensus that more should be done to develop the visitor economy in West Lindsey and the group had recommended that further work should be undertaken on the specific objectives of: increasing number of visitors / length of stay; increasing expenditure by visitors; developing leisure, culture and recreational offer, and increasing the quality and number of businesses / jobs in the sector.

The recommendations were then moved, seconded and voted upon.

RESOLVED: that

- a) the recommendation from the Challenge and Improvement Committee that the Visitor Economy is seen as a corporate priority with a focus on the objectives outlined above be agreed; and
- b) the remit for developing the visitor economy in West Lindsey be covered by the Member lead for 'Open for Business' and taken forward as identified within the emerging Economic Growth Strategy for the District.

39 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR LINCOLN EASTERN BYPASS

The Head of Development and Neighbourhoods outlined the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) required to be signed by West Lindsey District Council, North Kesteven District Council and City of Lincoln Council to ensure the delivery and funding, through S106 agreements from relevant planning applications, of the Lincoln Eastern Bypass.

Attention was drawn to the financial implications set out in the report – "That the council will use reasonable endeavours to secure contributions towards the Lincoln Eastern Bypass under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and where compliant with CIL regulation 122 from relevant planning applications in the area. By supporting the LEB it is anticipated that future developments will come forward that will contribute towards the cost of the LEB, without this improvement to the transport infrastructure it is unlikely that

these future development in the LEB area will be realised and therefore income streams would not be generated.”

The MOU was attached to the report as Appendix 1 and the following amendments had been made by LCC as follows:

- 5.1(a)WLDC, CITY and NKDC as local planning authorities will use all reasonable endeavours, *where compliant with CIL Regulation 122*, to secure
- 5.1(c) ... sought under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 *and where compliant with CIL Regulation 122*;
- Paragraph 5.1(g) The parties recognise the impact of not securing contributions towards the LEB on the long term deliverability of the infrastructure to support growth in and around Lincoln *and it will be considered* in their decision making processes on individual planning applications.

Some Members of the Committee expressed concerns regarding any benefits that would be achieved by the towns and villages of West Lindsey, and felt that alternative provision would be better to improve the transport infrastructure. The Chief Operating Officer pointed out that the Hawthorn Road bridge was separate from the matter of the Eastern bypass.

Advantages of the bypass were described, such as the release of development sites which would enable growth, ultimately generating NNDR. Members were also made aware that if West Lindsey did not contribute the whole scheme could fall and the government investment lost.

Whilst several Members still felt that they could not support the motion, on being seconded and voted upon it was:

- RESOLVED:** that
- a) the amendments in Section 3.1 be made to the MOU by Lincolnshire County Council;
 - b) the signing of the MOU, subject to the above amendments being made, be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer in consultation with the Chair of the Prosperous Communities Committee.

40 WORKPLAN (PRCC.21 14/15)

Members gave consideration to the Committee work plan.

Councillor Strange suggested that funding for isolated rural villages in terms of the InterConnect Service could be a topic for a future presentation to the Committee.

The Chairman of Challenge and Improvement Committee, Councillor Howitt-Cowan noted that, as discussed previously, the needs of vulnerable people could be a matter for the C&I committee to consider.

RESOLVED that the Work Plan as set out in report PRCC.21 13/14 be received and noted.

41 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED that under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

42 REQUEST FOR FREE CAR PARKING (PRCC.20 14/15)

The Team Manager Property and Assets presented to Members requests that had been received for free car parking to support three separate events in the town.

Note Councillor Bardsley declared a non-pecuniary interest at this point as being the Council's representative on the Gainsborough Town Partnership.

Members of the Committee felt that, whilst it was important to support commerce in the town centre, given that several of the events were scheduled for evenings or Sundays the requests were superfluous, and that given the loss of revenue that would be incurred, residents of West Lindsey would be being asked to subsidise Gainsborough businesses.

The Committee felt that there were other, more cost effective, ways in which the events could be given support.

RESOLVED that the requests for free car parking at each of the three events listed in the report be declined.

The meeting concluded at 8.57 pm.

Chairman