

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 13 September 2016 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Sheila Bibb (Chairman)
Councillor Gillian Bardsley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Malcolm Parish
Councillor Mrs Diana Rodgers
Councillor Lesley Rollings
Councillor Thomas Smith
Councillor Trevor Young
Councillor Giles McNeill

In Attendance:
Mark Sturgess Chief Operating Officer
Ady Selby Operational Services Team manager
Andy Gray Housing and Communities Team Manager
Grant White Lead Officer Enterprising Communities
Katie Coughlan Governance and Civic Officer

Apologies: Councillor Steve England
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan

Membership: Councillor McNeill substituted for Councillor Howitt-Cowan

34 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

35 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on 19 July 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

36 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE

Members gave consideration to the Matters Arising Schedule which set out the current position of all previously agreed actions as at 5 September 2016.

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

37 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

38 COMMUNITY DEFIBRILLATOR SCHEME

Consideration was given to a report which sought approval of the creation of a new scheme to provide community accessible defibrillators, using existing funds from the Community Grants Programme.

The proposed scheme was outlined in Section 2 of the report and was summarised to Members. The report also contained details of the eligibility criteria, application process and how the Scheme, if approved, would be promoted.

In order to finance the scheme, funds would be allocated from the existing Community Grants Scheme Earmarked Reserve. No additional budget pressure would occur.

The scheme cost of equipment and installation for 30 sites was £40,800. The Council would meet up to 80% of this cost, with 20% to be funded by each location. The Council would incur the full £40,800 up-front expenditure and recover the 20% from each location prior to installation. The net impact on the Community Grants Scheme Earmarked Reserve would be £32,640

This would leave £154,754 available to deliver the Small, Large and Match Funding Grant schemes during 2017/2018.

Debate ensued with all Members acknowledging the merits of the scheme and how it supported the Council's commitment to assist our communities to assist themselves. The common device across the District approach was also welcomed and would be of assistance to, and support the work of, the first responders. Expectation was that the scheme would be prove popular.

Assurance was sought and received that the duty to maintain any device purchased and installed through this scheme, would be the responsibility of the applicant. This was contained within the terms and conditions of the grant funding. Furthermore all communities that received a defibrillator would be required to complete monitoring. This would include keeping a record of the

number of uses and maintenance logs.

Assurance was also sought and received that once installed the emergency services and local communities would be made aware of their existence and locations. Officers advised that each device would be registered with the East Midlands Ambulance service and loaded into their database. The scheme would be promoted on the Council's website together with an interactive map, showing their locations and on installation, the cost of the device, including an awareness / training session for up to 12 members of the community.

In response to some scenarios cited by Members wherein communities had purchased (by others means) a defibrillator device and the units had either not been registered, or were in-accessible either due to their location or cabinet type, and therefore not being put to best use, assurance was offered by Officers that this would not be the case with devices purchased under this Scheme. It was reiterated that devices would be registered with EMAS, all cabinets would be in accessible locations, on the outside wall of buildings and accessed by a pin code issued on dialling the emergency services making them also secure from theft or misuse. Officers indicated there may be ways this scheme could assist those communities whom had already purchased a device but needed help registering it, or a more appropriate cabinet for example.

Whilst not detracting from the proposed Scheme's value to the community, some Members questioned whether in fact the Council should be providing such a service. It felt outside of the Council's core business, which some Members suggested should be the focus, particularly those core services which were under performing. The role of the CCGs and health charities was questioned, and there was concern that if the district was covered by a defibrillator scheme, the emergency services would be diverted elsewhere.

In responding, it was stressed by Officers that the ambulance service, was an East Midlands wide service and therefore it was common practice for local crews to attend incidents in other districts and counties, this practice would change as a result of this Scheme. The Council was already funding such devices through its other funding streams on an ad hoc basis. This proposal aimed to ensure best value for the devices and thus make better use of the limited funding monies the Council had available to communities, the Scheme also facilitated a level of control around citing, ensuring they were accessible and allowed the council to gather statistics on usage and impact. CCGs did not widely fund community defibrillators and they were seen very much as a local resource. Health charities were often nation-wide and would therefore not fund a district wide rollout. Whilst other Members were in agreement that the scheme did sit in the health arena, they were of the view that this was a community project and that the District Council had duties to support, promote and protect the well-being of its residents.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the launch of the Community Defibrillator Scheme be approved;

- (b) the use of funds from the Community Grants Scheme Earmarked Reserve be approved; and
- (c) the Enterprising Communities Team Manager be delegated to arrange the specific details of delivery for this project in partnership with LIVES.

39 INDEPENDENT LIVING POLICY

Members gave consideration to a report which introduced the West Lindsey Independent Living Policy 2017-2019 as a replacement and update to the West Lindsey Housing Assistance Policy 2014 -2016.

It was noted that the previous West Lindsey Housing Assistance Policy 2014-2016 covered all aspects of delivering DFG's and Empty Properties initiatives. The Council's policy in regards to empty properties was currently being reviewed and would be brought to Committee at a later date.

The proposed West Lindsey Independent Living Policy 2017-2019 replaced the above mentioned policy and set out how the Council intended to undertake DFG's and also improve its service by offering another project through independent living, this being the pilot project for stairlifts, which was fully detailed in Section 3 of the report and page 14 of the Policy.

The main changes to the Policy from 2014-2016 were shared with the Committee and included: -

- The introduction of the pilot project for stairlifts
- The procedure for applying for grant funding towards an adaptation of the applicants choosing
- The inclusion of extensions being considered and specific information as to when they are able to be considered.
- Competent contractor assessment criteria
- Removal of empty homes initiatives (to be replaced by a new policy in 16/17)

Debate ensued and the Policy was welcomed by all Members of the Committee. In response to Members' concerns around the turnaround times and costs detailed in Section 3.4 of the report, Officers indicated the proposed pilot project would address these areas, referring Members to paragraph 3.3 of the report which detailed the aims and advantages of the pilot.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the Independent Living Policy 2017-2019 be approved;
- (b) the pilot project for stair-lifts as set out in the policy be approved; and
- (c) the additional charges proposed within the stair-lift pilot be **RECOMMENDED** to Full Council for approval in order that they can come into effect as soon as possible.

40 RISEHOLME NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Consideration was given to a report which presented the up-to-date position in terms of the development of the Riseholme Neighbourhood Plan. The report recommended that the Plan proceed to the Public Referendum stage following a successful independent examination.

The Committee commended the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Planning Officer, the support he offered local communities and welcomed the submission of many more Neighbourhood Plans to come.

RESOLVED that the Riseholme Neighbourhood Plan be formally approved to advance to the Public Referendum stage, in line with the advice received from the Independent Examiner.

41 WORK PLAN

Members gave consideration to the Committee work plan.

Referring to the workplan item entitled "Presentation by Age UK", currently scheduled for October, Councillor Bierley requested that an invitation be extended to all Members of the Council to attend for this.

Referring to the workplan item entitled "Market Rasen Car Parking" Councillor Smith sought and received assurance from Officers that consultation with Ward Members would be undertaken prior to the Committee receiving the report.

RESOLVED that the Work Plan as set out in report PRCC.25 16/17 be received and noted.

42 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 item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

Note: Councillor Trevor Young declared in a personal interest in the following item of business as, in his role as an elected Member, he had met with the Market Federation and the Independent Traders Group (who would form the Gainsborough Co-operative), and he was also a seasonal trader on occasion.

43 GAINSBOROUGH MARKETS FUTURE DELIVERY

In April 2016, Prosperous Communities Committee had resolved to explore the options for improving Gainsborough's street market in order to achieve a cost neutral solution. As part of this research, officers had explored a range of delivery options to ensure that the decision-making process was robust and lawful; whilst having regard to the objective of operating the market at zero cost to the Council.

Members gave consideration to a report which outlined proposals for the future restructure and delivery of Gainsborough's street market. The report outlined the current operation and performance of the market, together with some objectives for the future market operation which sought to address the weaknesses with the current operation and capitalise on the opportunities to grow and diversify the offer, these being: -

1. To reduce the subsidy and deliver a cost-neutral market
2. To operate an efficient and effective market; where the rules are enforced, fees are collected, trader enquiries are dealt with promptly and trader satisfaction is high
3. To grow the number of traders and to diversify the 'offer'
4. To improve the appearance of the market by ensuring an attractive stall layout (which is conducive to trade for local businesses as well as traders)
5. To improve the visibility of the market through effective signage and the regeneration of key routes and sites within the town centre
6. To make imaginative use of the Market Place for events and activities alongside and in addition to the street market

Section 5 of the report detailed a comprehensive options appraisal for future delivery which would help deliver the above objectives. A total of 10 options had been appraised, 5 which would see the operation stay in-house and 5 which could see the market outsourced or operated by a third party. Each option had an Officer recommendation contained within, and Option 3 was being proposed, as the best to meet the objectives established.

Lengthy and detailed discussion ensued with opposing views expressed. A number of Members did not consider the proposed option went far enough. There was also a view that it did not offer best value nor that it would lead to the best outcomes. It was suggested that some of the other options contained within the report should have been more prevalent.

Members referred to a document which had been tabled, and sought clarity as to its purpose. A Member indicated that it was the Business Plan from the GMC and that he had circulated it for Members information. He was of the view that this should have been included within the report in its entirety and have been more prevalent in the main committee report

In response to Members' questions, Officers confirmed that they had had sight of the document, and the reasons for it not being the recommended option at this stage were clearly set out and evaluated at on page 10 of the report. Officers were of the view that the proposed option offered more resilience than the

Business Plan from GMC, citing a number of scenarios to support this view, nor had TUPE requirements been taken into consideration. The Chief Operating Officer advise members that they should disregard the circulated paper and take a decision based on the information contained in the report as this had taken account of the information contained in this paper.

Again responding to Members' questions, it was confirmed that TUPE was a legal burden, contained within employment law and could not be mitigated against. The TUPE requirements must be met by any outside operator taking on a council function to be operated by transferred council staff.

A number of Members expressed their frustration that the proposal just did not move the market on far enough and without different thinking nothing would change. Some Members' questioned whether Council's had the right skills and abilities to operate markets and therefore should be making greater of use of such organisations as the GMC who had the knowledge, networks and resources, to make the market thrive. The timeline was also of concern.

In responding to Members questions Officers outlined the proposed new posts function, stressing this was a much wider role with an emphasis on collaboration, acknowledging this had been missing in recent years. One of the key tasks for this new post would be to establish a stakeholder holder committee, to gather views and engage partners and to investigate alternative options, including some of those which had been suggested throughout the course of the debate, such as flea markets and antique markets.

In contrast, other Members acknowledged that the market was key to the wider regeneration of Gainsborough and in particular the Market Place area, and that a longer term, common sense approach was more appropriate if it ensured the safeguarding of the market. The vision of positive management and enforcement going forward was welcomed and had been missing in recent years.

In light of the differing views expressed a Member proposed an alternative motion, this being that Option 9 should be further explored in the first instance with a further report expanding on the evaluation of this option being brought back to a subsequent meeting of the Committee. Officers indicated the potential delay this would incur, but having been moved and seconded the motion fell.

The recommendations as written in the report were then moved and seconded and on being put to the vote it was: -

RESOLVED that:

- (a) Option 3 as outlined in the report and the appended Business Plan be approved;
- (b) that Members review progress against the Business Plan targets in April 2017 and thereafter on an annual basis; and
- (c) a formal public consultation exercise for the future delivery of

Prosperous Communities Committee- 13 September 2016
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on Monday 26 September 2016

the market be undertaken following the implementation of
Option 3.

Note: Councillors Trevor Young and Lesley Rollings requested that
their vote against the above decision be recorded.

The meeting concluded at 8.22 pm.

Chairman