

**Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA**

Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

AGENDA

This meeting will be recorded and the video archive published on our website

Corporate Policy and Resources Committee

Thursday, 21st September, 2017 at 6.30 pm

Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA

Members:

Councillor Jeff Summers (Chairman)
Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Mrs Sheila Bibb
Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Steve England
Councillor Ian Fleetwood
Councillor Stuart Kinch
Councillor John McNeill
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Trevor Young

1. Apologies for Absence**2. Public Participation Period**

Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation. Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

(PAGES 5 - 20)

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the previous meeting.

i) For Approval

Corporate Policy and Resources Committee meeting 27 July 2017.

4. Declarations of Interest

Members may make declarations of Interest at this point or may make them at any point in the meeting.

5. **Matters Arising Schedule** (PAGES 21 - 24)
Setting out current position of previously agreed actions as at 13 September 2017.
6. **Public Reports for Approval:**
- i) Carbon Efficiency Project (PAGES 25 - 28)
 - ii) Commercial Opportunity - Battery Storage (PAGES 29 - 34)
 - iii) Purchase of a replacement Civic vehicle (PAGES 35 - 40)
 - iv) Gainsborough Town Centre Townscape Heritage Application (PAGES 41 - 46)
 - v) Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) - Proposed Funding Bid (PAGES 47 - 54)
 - vi) Committee Work Plan (PAGES 55 - 56)
7. **Exclusion of Public and Press**
To resolve 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 it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.
8. **Exempt Reports for Approval**
- i) Gainsborough Marina - Blue and Green Infrastructure Bid (PAGES 57 - 166)
 - ii) Replacement Housing Register (CBL) and Homelessness IT system (PAGES 167 - 172)
 - iii) Unlocking Housing Update (PAGES 173 - 188)

Mark Sturgess
Interim Head of Paid Services
The Guildhall
Gainsborough

Wednesday, 13 September 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Policy and Resources Committee- 27 July 2017
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on 18th August 2017

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 27 July 2017 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Jeff Summers (Chairman)
Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Mrs Sheila Bibb
Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Steve England
Councillor Ian Fleetwood
Councillor Stuart Kinch
Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Trevor Young

In Attendance:
Ian Knowles Director of Resources and S151 Officer
Mark Sturgess Chief Operating Officer
Karen Whitfield Community Commercial Investment Programmes Manager
Lesley Beevers
David Kirkup
Amanda Boutell
Katy Allen Corporate Governance Officer
Katie Coughlan Governance & Civic Officer

Apologies: Councillor David Cotton
Councillor John McNeill

Membership: Councillor Giles McNeill substituting for Councillor John McNeill

21 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS FOR APPROVAL

(a) Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee – 15 June 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee held on 15 June 2017 be confirmed and signed as a

correct record.

(b) Special Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee – 11 July 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee held on 11 July 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

23 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS FOR NOTING

(a) Meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Committee – 6 July 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Committee held on 6 July 2017 be noted.

24 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE

Members gave consideration to the Matters Arising Schedule which set out the current position of all previously agreed actions as at 19 July 2017.

Making reference to the action entitled “Discretionary Rate Relief”, Members welcomed the report’s inclusion into the Work Plan and also wished to place on record their thanks to the Team for resolving the majority of the matters previously brought to their attention.

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

25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

26 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT - TO VARY THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The Chairman indicated, that with Committee’s approval, he wished to vary the order of the agenda, taking agenda item 6 (f) (Budget Consultation Proposal for 2018/19) as the first item, after which the remaining items would be considered as per the order of the published agenda.

RESOLVED that the order of the agenda be varied as detailed above.

27 BUDGET CONSULTATION PROPOSAL FOR 2018/19

Consideration was given to a report which provided Members with proposals on how the budget consultation for the 2018/19 budget would be undertaken, including use of an online budget simulator.

In presenting the report the Director of Resources outlined the principles any formal consultation must adhere to, and the multiple routes which were being proposed to ensure as wide a range of views as possible could be sought. This included holding 3 events across the District, an online tool, social media question and answer session and a survey to

businesses.

Further detail on each consultation route was provided, together with timescales on when the consultation would be undertaken.

It was noted that the use of budget consultation software was being proposed in response to previous feedback to make the consultation more interactive, Members were then given a demonstration of the software, the features it offered and the questions and options respondents would be asked and given.

Debate ensued and Members welcomed the use of the software. Whilst accepting the software was still in development, Members urged Officers to ensure the introductory wording and language used on each page was as understandable and as relevant as possible to the public.

In response Officers indicated that prior to the consultation software going live, they would share the proposed final version with all Members of the Committee in order that they could comment and feedback on issues such as wording and layout.

Members recognised the extra dimension this tool provided to engage the public, and commented that it was likely to attract different people to take part. Consultation events had their place in any consultation process, however it was important that consultation was offered in new, modern and engaging ways also, and this software appeared to have that ability.

In response to the suggestion that other subjects could be consulted on whilst seeking views on the budget, namely green waste charging, Officers indicated that this matter would require its own consultation and the two would likely overlap, hence why it had not been included.

It was also suggested that the budget consultation event could offer an opportunity to raise awareness of rural funding issues. The Leader indicated he was considering submitting a motion to Full Council on this matter.

A Member sought detail regarding the basis on which the software had been procured, indicating that a number of large parishes, if possible, may welcome the opportunity to share its use. Engaging residents in consultation was important, yet often difficult to gain a range of views and this tool had the potential to attract wider responses.

Officers advised this had been bought on a licence basis costing around £1,000 pa and if parishes wished to share its use this could be investigated.

In response to a Member question Officers advised that it was being proposed that through the budget simulator, residents would not be offered the opportunity to increase budgets in service areas, the reason being that if consultation responses of this nature were sought and received, arguably they would be of little value, as currently the Authority did not have additional funds to commit.

RESOLVED that the proposal for consulting on the 2018/19 budget be agreed.

28 ANNUAL HEALTH AND SAFETY REPORT

Consideration was given to a report which aimed to provide Members, Strategic Leads, Managers and Employees with information on how health and safety had developed and performed over the previous year.

The role of Safety Champions was highlighted, showing how they assisted managers by carrying out inspections, identifying health and safety concerns, investigating accidents and assisting in provision of solutions.

The purpose of the report was to:

1. Give Members and leadership team reassurance and confidence that health, safety and welfare is being properly managed within the organisation by sharing of information on progress and delivery.
2. Maintain health, safety and welfare at the front and centre of the organisation as a corporate priority.
3. Demonstrate the transparent, proactive management and control of corporate risk, legal compliance and reputation.
4. Provide an auditable trail of engagement with Members and senior leadership that would contribute to demonstrating compliance to external enforcement agencies.

The report showed that accidents were recorded on Minerva (“Keep me Safe, Keep me Well” page) and accidents which were reportable under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR) were reported to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) by the Health and Safety Co-ordinator. There were four reportable incidents in 2016-17. They were all over seven day injuries in Operational Services.

There had been an increase in recorded incidents in the last year but the incidents reported had not shown any clear trends.

Training was continually improving as was work on the Round Risk Assessments.

Members placed on record their thanks to the former Health and Safety Advisor Kim Leith, who had recently left the Authority, for all her hard work.

It was noted that the Team Manager for Regulatory Services, who had presented the report to Members, would also shortly be leaving the organisation and again Members thanked her for the work she had undertaken on behalf of the Authority.

RESOLVED that the Health and Safety Annual Report be supported and noted.

29 REVIEW OF THE RIPA POLICY

Members gave consideration to a report which sought approval of the revised Regulation of Investigatory Powers (RIPA) Policy.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) the revised Regulation of Investigatory Powers (RIPA) Policy, as attached to the report be approved; and
- (b) the Chief Operating Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee, be granted delegated authority to undertake any future housekeeping amendments required to the Policy as and when necessary.

30 PROGRESS AND DELIVERY PERIOD 1

Members gave consideration to a report which assessed the performance of the Council's services and key projects through agreed performance measures. A revised set of measures was appended to the report for approval. Members were asked to review performance and recommend areas where improvements should be made, having regard to any remedial measures already included within the report.

The report summary was structured to highlight those areas that were performing above expectations, those areas where there was a risk to either performance or delivery and those areas where further work was required to either improve the quality of the information provided to Members or where work was already underway to address poor performance.

Areas described as performing well included: The Budget, Building Control and Local Land Charges.

Those areas described as risks included: Enforcement; Food Safety (Regulatory Team), Gainsborough Markets and Homelessness.

Future work would be undertaken regarding the measurement of customer satisfaction.

Further information was given on each of the above.

Debate ensued and a number of Members expressed dissatisfaction at the market's performance and the continued delay of the options paper for this service, despite the poor performance.

Concern was also expressed at the performance within Enforcement, particularly at the initial response time which could often be weeks as opposed to days. This was not creating a positive image for the service. Furthermore non response often meant Members were becoming involved in issues that should be for Officers to resolve.

Members were keen that further progress was made with the tenant passport scheme, in order that Selective Licensing achieved all it had intended to. It was important that Selective Licensing offered benefits and support for those responsible landlords and the tenant passport scheme would go some way to achieving this.

The current position with regard to Food Inspections was considered unacceptable with Members acknowledging that this was an important service function, with serious implications if it was not running effectively.

With regard to the dip in performance for the indicator “cost of Trinity Arts per user”, it was noted that the figures for the period, included some one-off annual costs and thus this was a financial profiling issue. The indicator was expected to resume its normal position in the next period.

In responding Officers acknowledged Members’ concerns regarding Food Inspections and advised that this was the first quarter that the service appeared to be at risk of poor performance, this was thought to be as result of a number of short term absences, however a review of the service was planned for early August to ensure the service remained effective.

Officers were accepting of the comments around the performance of the Enforcement service. In response to previous concerns, new resource had been allocated to the service since February 2017 and it was anticipated the benefits and impact of this additional resource would soon be evident. It was expected that the indicators would be showing an improved position by the end of the next period.

Officers confirmed that progress was being made with the tenant passport scheme.

Again Officers were accepting of the comments raised in respect of the Markets performance. Assurance was offered that an options paper would be submitted to the September meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee.

On that basis it was:-

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) the new measures proposed, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report, be approved; and
- (b) having critically appraised the performance of services and key projects, and having had regard to the remedial measures suggested in the report, and the information provided in response to Member questions, no further action be requested at this stage.

Note: Following the above vote having been taken a Member indicated that the Committee should request a further report back on the position of food inspections. The Chief Operating Officer indicated that the report was next due at the Challenge and Improvement Committee and the Committee’s comments and suggestions would be noted there.

31 BUDGET AND TREASURY MONITORING PERIOD 1

Members gave consideration to a report which set out the revenue, capital and treasury management activity from 1 April 2017 to 31 May 2017.

The current position was summarised as follows:-

The final out-turn position had seen a contribution of £1.059m to General Fund Balances.

The draft revenue forecast out-turn position for 2017/18 was currently reflecting a net contribution to reserves of £50k as at 31 May 2017, this was after approved carry forwards of £19k, further details were contained in Appendix A of the associated report

The items with significant variances were detailed within the report at section 2.2.

The capital out-turn position for 2017/18 was £19,354k

Average investments for the period were £20,280k with an average rate of 1.23%.

There had been no breaches of Treasury or Prudential Indicators to report and the Authority had again out-performed its benchmark in relation to investment yields.

A Member of the Committee queried why market stall take up appeared be down and yet income received in this area appeared to be up.

In the absence of the Financial Services Manager, the Director of Resources undertook to further investigate and report back to Members outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) the forecast out-turn position of a £50k net contribution to reserves as at 31 May 2017 (2.1) be accepted;
- (b) the use of Earmarked Reserves during the quarter approved by the Director of Resources using Delegated powers (2.1) be noted;
- (c) the forecast Capital out turn position of £19,254k be accepted;
- (d) the capital expenditure on land acquisition be approved;
- (e) the Commercial Income position be accepted; and
- (f) the Treasury position to 31 May 2017 be accepted.

Note: Councillor Giles McNeill joined the meeting during consideration of the above item at 7.21pm

32 2016/17 - FINANCIAL REVIEW

Consideration was given to a report which provided Members with a financial review of 2016/17.

The financial positions was summarised as follows: -

The revenue out-turn position resulted in a Net Contribution to the General Fund Balance of £1,059k, resulting in an overall balance of £4,048k. £115k had been earmarked to the Business Rates Volatility Reserve.

The items with significant variances in 2016/17 which could have an impact on the future Medium Financial Plan were detailed at paragraph 1.1 of the associated report.

The capital out-turn position for 2016/17 was as previously reported at £2,584k.

The Council had remained in a good financial position due to the following factors;

- A surplus revenue out turn position
- A General Fund Balance in excess of the minimum balance
- Revenue Reserves in excess of the annual Budget requirement providing assurance at this time of our sustainability.
- Availability of Earmarked reserves for future investment in Corporate Priority objectives and for mitigating budget risks/volatilities.
- Assets exceeded liabilities, which was a positive position when considering the value of the Pension Fund Liability
- Evidenced economic growth, generating additional taxation income.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) the out-turn position and the net contribution to the General Fund Balance of £1,059k be accepted;
- (b) the final position in relation to Useable Reserves of £21,221k be accepted;
- (c) the financial analysis and positive financial management be welcomed; and
- (d) £450k of the 2016/17 surplus to the Revenue Budget 2017/18 be allocated as follows;
 - £150k to support the Customer First Programme
 - £150k to support revenue costs of development of Regeneration and Growth Schemes
 - £150k to support Invest to Save initiatives

33 COMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Members gave consideration to the Committee Work Plan.

Members welcomed the inclusion of the “Discretionary Rate Relief – share of £300m” item to their November meeting. However it was noted that Public Houses with a rateable value of £100k+ could claim rebates now, the Vice Chairman urged Members to make such establishments within their Wards aware of this.

A brief discussion ensued as to whether there would be exceptions to this Policy, with Members naming establishments that struggled and repeatedly failed due to the considerable

business rates requirements placed on them.

In response it was confirmed that such rebates were not available to chain public houses. Rateable value was based on turnover, however turnover was not re-assessed on a regular basis.

Members expressed concern at the way rateable values were set and the difficulties this caused some businesses, however, in response it was stressed that the setting of rateable values was a function of the Government's Valuation Office.

RESOLVED that the Work Plan as set out in the report, be received and noted.

34 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.

35 CAISTOR - HILL CREST PARK RURAL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

The Committee gave consideration to a report which sought support from Members to approve a **RECOMMENDATION** from the Prosperous Communities Committee for the granting of a commercial loan of £200,000 to support the redevelopment of a site and creation of new business units within Caistor.

Providing support and infrastructure for start-ups and the micro-business sector was a priority for WLDC and was clearly identified within the West Lindsey Economic Growth Strategy.

In presenting the report, Officers outlined the opportunities associated with the regeneration of the site, as detailed in Section 1.7 of the report. It was also noted that the project proposal had had support through the Caistor Neighbourhood Plan, had been granted planning permission, and had received a LEADER grant of £39k and would be seeking a further amount of circa £80k, totalling £119,000. The reasons why the applicant had approached the Council were outlined, together with the associated risks and mitigating measures which it was proposed would be in place to ensure any monies released were safeguarded.

This matter had been considered twice previously by Members of the Prosperous Communities Committee who had deferred the decision at their meeting on 6 June 2017, pending further information regarding the Business Plan in order that they could be assured that the Project was likely to deliver as expected.

Officers indicated that all those concerns previously raised by Members of that Committee had been further investigated and the outcome of each, and further re-assurance was reported in the table included within the Executive Summary of the report.

It was noted that when the proposal had last been considered by the Prosperous

Communities Committee a number of drafting errors within the legal agreement had been identified, these were outlined to the Committee and Officers gave assurance these would be rectified, should the proposal be agreed.

Officers also clarified why the interest rate for the loan had not been definitively set within the report but offered assurance on how this would be calculated and the percentage margins which would be achieved.

Debate ensued and a number of Members' were supportive of the proposals and recognised the benefit and need for such development in the area. Members did query why assistance was being sought from the Local Authority as opposed to a bank. The applicant's financial situation was outlined with Members, noting that the loan would cover the build.

In response to Members concerns, the Director of Resources again outlined the mitigations which would be put in place to safeguard the loan and offered assurance that all of these would be referenced within the legal agreement if the loan was agreed.

The total size of the site was clarified, together with how residual site valuation was calculated. Members considered any charge made should be on all land in ownership. Officers indicated personal guarantees could be considered as part of due diligence.

Having noted that the Loan would be drawn down against expenditure and on completion of each build stage, Members sought and received assurance that the position reported would be confirmed by a person appointed by the Authority. The Director of Resources confirmed this to be the case, and indicated who this would likely be.

Following much debate it was **RESOLVED** that: -

- (a) the recommendation from Prosperous Communities Committee be accepted and a Capital Budget of £200,000 for a commercial loan to Hillcrest Park Properties Ltd, to enable the redevelopment of the Hillcrest site in Caistor in line with the planning permission which had been granted be approved. This to be funded from Prudential Borrowing and the commercial loan to be conditional on the applicant securing a full funding package for the development and providing evidence to this effect.
- (b) the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee be accepted and the proposed Loan Agreement, appended to the report be approved subject to those drafting errors identified and reported to the Committee being amended; and
- (c) the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee be accepted and Director of Resources in consultation with the Chair of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee be granted delegated authority to agree any final changes to the Loan Agreement (including pre-conditions), noting Members' comments expressed during the debate.

Note: Councillor Young requested that his vote against the above decision be recorded.

36 CAR PARKING STRATEGY - UPDATE REPORT

Consideration was given to a report which reviewed and updated the current Gainsborough Car Park Strategy to ensure that the supply of car parking was responsive to both current and future demand; and to ensure it aligned to the regeneration programme of the town.

The primary aim of the review was to support town centre viability and local traders, demonstrating that the Council had listened and responded to concerns in this regard.

The review had appraised the current charging tariffs and permit prices to ensure that the proposed improvements to town centre car parking was affordable and self-financing in line with the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan. This strategy would include a communication plan and a consultation exercise to ascertain local business and shoppers' views on the effectiveness of the "Free after 3pm" policy on viability, as opposed to an alternative, of "One hour free at any time".

An addendum had been included within the report, which primarily related to the Roseway Car Park, its refurbishment and the financing of such, the content of which superseded recommendation two, bullet point 3.

To aide Members understandings of the proposals, a short power point presentation was given, during which Members were provided with information in respect of the following: -

- The current position, noting that in December 2016, with the loss of two large private car parks, demand outstripped supply;
- The details of Phase 1 recommendations relating to new supply generation and when this supply would become available as a result;
- The other recommendations associated with Phase 1 and the costs to the Council or income generated to the Council, as a result;
- The business case regarding the Roseway Car park and the rationale for this being delivered in an alternative way, as per the information included in the addendum;
- The new supply which would be generated by Autumn 2018;
- Details of those recommendations it was proposed would be implemented with immediate effect;
- Details of the Phase 2 recommendations and the current sites which were under consideration.

It was noted that the matter had been considered earlier in the month by the Prosperous Communities Committee, and arising from that meeting they had made a number of recommendations for consideration relating to the financing of the review recommendations.

Since that meeting further amendments were being proposed to those recommendations, namely: -

- that the requested capital budget of £40,000 for the construction of the Bridge Street extension, funded by prudential borrowing be increased to £50,000. This was in light of current tender prices received todate.
- the use of permits be prohibited in both Roseway and **Ship Court** to facilitate an increased turnover of parking to benefit town centre businesses. This was

in response to concerns raised by Members of the Prosperous Communities and having been able to assess the impact of the suggested change. In light of the additional car park being included in the prohibition, implementation would also be delayed until November, allowing time for the new supply to come on-line and mitigate oversubscription.

As earlier advised to Members the addendum within the report, superseded recommendation two, bullet point 3, in that it sought an additional £20,000 towards the financing of the Roseway Car Park refurbishment. This would be by way of a capped grant. The rationale for the work being undertaken and managed in this way was explained noting that any risks would sit with DPL.

Members were asked to note these proposed amendments.

Debate ensued and in opening Members immediately sought indication as to whether, if the proposals were approved, the re-design of Roseway Car Park would be implemented in its current guise. Concern was expressed that consultation only appeared to have commenced with affected businesses recently, also that Members of the Committee had not had an opportunity to see the Plan as it stood.

Members sought indication as to whether lease agreements had been reviewed for those business premises which backed onto the car park, in terms of delivery arrangement agreements to ensure these proposals were not in conflict.

Officers in attendance indicated the current design had been drawn up by DPL, their agents had been made aware of the issues raised by Members, and the design was subject to change. The Leader of the Council clarified how additional spaces had been accommodated and this included land not currently designated as parking spaces. Other Members however were still concerned that the additional spaces had been found by making it extremely difficult for existing businesses to trade and this could not be permitted to happen. Supporting current businesses needed to be a priority. The Leader offered his personal assurance that any changes to the layout of Roseway Car Park would not be to the detriment of existing businesses. This would not be permitted to happen.

Concern was also expressed at the parking arrangements being extended to hotel guests, they believed this to be contrary to previous discussions and considered that there was ample alternative parking which the hotel developer could provide at his own cost. With the re-design of the Roseway Car Park and the pending development in the surrounding area, Members considered this was an opportune time for charges and charging times to be reviewed. Clarity was also sought whether the parking arrangements extended to hotel guests was a permanent offer as Members felt this should not be the case. The Director of Resources indicated he was of the belief that this was however part of the leasing agreement.

The additional inclusion of Ship Court in the prohibition of permit use was a welcomed amendment. However some Members were of a view that this prohibition needed to be extended to cover Bridge Street Car Park at the earliest opportunity to ensure the turnover of spaces, which did not currently happen and in some Members' view was affecting town centre businesses ability to trade.

Not all Members, particularly those representing the Gainsborough area, were of the belief that the identified new supply would mitigate the need for parking in the market place. Clarity was sought as to whether this was now not being considered and if so expressed concerns that residents were not being listened to.

Again concerns were raised that the current re-design proposals would be to the detriment of existing businesses, there was a view that no allowances had been made for deliveries, waste collection/ storage. Whilst noting comments regarding timed deliveries and alternative arrangements being investigated it was stressed that such arrangements were not always an available option and this would create a further barrier for existing businesses to trade.

In light of concerns over the lack of consultation with existing businesses it was moved and seconded that the proposals be deferred pending full and proper consultation with existing businesses.

Members wanted assurance that they would have the opportunity to review and agree the final design, as opposed to a first draft. The Car Park was an asset of the Council and thus they should drive its redesign.

A Member of the Committee raised concerns that the Committee were straying outside of their purview, advising their remit was to approve any funding required to achieve the Strategy, as opposed to the details of that Strategy.

Officers again offered reassurance that all of those issues raised by Members during the debate had already been raised with the designer, and were being reviewed, the design was subject to change and supporting existing businesses was a shared priority. The Leader also offered his personal assurance that he would not allow existing businesses' ability to trade to be affected in any detrimental way. He offered assurance that they would be consulted and their views taken into consideration in developing the final design

Having received these assurances the motion to defer was withdrawn and in order to satisfy the Committee's concerns, whilst being mindful of their purview the following two additional recommendations were moved: -

“Officers are instructed to note the concerns raised regarding access and waste collections to Church Street businesses, and their ability to trade should not be affected in any detrimental way as a result of the re-designed Roseway Car Park”

“The Director of Resources and the Director of Commercial and Economic Growth be granted delegated authority to agree the final design layout for the Roseway Car Park in consultation with both Policy Committee Chairmen and wider Members as those Chairmen deem appropriate.”

On the above being seconded it was **RESOLVED** that: -

- (a) the findings of the car parking review be used as the evidence base to enable the Council to manage car parking supply and demand including the charging regime up to 2023 as part of the regeneration plans for the town.

- (b) the Phase 1 recommendations, set out in section 7 of the report, be implemented namely:
- Liaison with Marshalls Yard to manage their overflow car parking at peak times more effectively and especially to cater for the development of the hotel at the Sun Inn and refurbishment of the Roseway car park.
 - the recommendation from Prosperous Communities committee be accepted and a capital budget of £40,000 plus and additional £10,000 as advised to the Committee be approved to spend within the current year for construction of the Bridge Street extension, funded by prudential borrowing.
 - the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee be accepted and a capital budget of £450,000 be built into 2018/19 capital programme for construction works at Roseway, funded by prudential borrowing and the scheme be delivered by North Street (Gainsborough) Limited through a Grant Funding Agreement;
 - that charging for the new Bridge Street extension commence as soon as practicable after the building works have ceased.
 - the recommendation from Prosperous Communities Committee be accepted and parking charges for Roseway be increased by 25% when it re-opens post refurbishment in Autumn 2018.
 - that charging for parking at Lidl commence as soon as practicable upon completion of the property purchase.
 - the recommendation from Prosperous Communities committee be accepted and parking permits be increased in two stages, 2018/19 and 2019/20 in order to achieve a charge that reflects a 45% discount on the long stay (6+ hours) ticket price. Further advice with regards to the maximum number of permits to be sold (note the financial model is based on 60% of chargeable spaces) be taken
 - That four of the eight disabled spaces at North Street be redesignated as available for all users from 1 April 2018, providing 6 standard bays in their place.
 - the recommendation from Prosperous Communities committee be accepted and the lease with Tesco for 50 parking spaces be extended and negotiations to purchase this land as a minimum continue up to a maximum value as indicated in the model;
 - That the hotel construction company be allowed free use of 30 spaces at Roseway car park in exchange for a parcel of land that will facilitate a minimum 16 additional parking spaces at the car park.
 - the use of permits in both Roseway and Ship Court (a change from the position

reported to Prosperous Communities Committee) be prohibited to facilitate an increased turnover of parking to benefit town centre businesses with effect from 1 November 2017

- further liaise with LCC Highways to seek additional and more prominent signage directing road users to car parks. To supplement existing signage within car parks, providing information regarding other long and short stay car parks including locations.
- Seek to designate 2-3 coach parking bays within the town centre, potentially 1 space in the existing Lidl site at Ropery Road and a further 2 in the bus station.

In addition, that the Council consult town centre businesses and stakeholders on the following:

- Allow the first hour parking to be free at any time; or
 - To retain the free after 3pm policy.
- (c) the recommendation from Prosperous Communities committee be accepted and these costs be approved as part of the Car Parking Funding Strategy.
- (d) The Phase 2 Recommendations in section 9 of the report, be agreed in principle, subject to detailed business cases for each acquisition when the feasibility work concludes on a site by site basis.
- (e) a review of the Market Rasen car parking charges (based on the methodology used for the Gainsborough review) commence with immediate effect, and the results be brought back to both the Prosperous Communities Committee and the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee in September.
- (f) Officers be instructed to note the concerns raised regarding access and waste collections to Church Street businesses, and their ability to trade should not be affected in any detrimental way as a result of the re-designed Roseway Car Park; and
- (g) The Director of Resources and the Director of Commercial and Economic Growth be granted delegated authority to agree the final design layout for the Roseway Car Park in consultation with both Policy Committee Chairmen and wider Members as those Chairmen deem appropriate.

Note Councillor Stuart Kinch declared a personal interest in the above item of business as he was part owner of business located on Church Street

37 COMMERCIAL PROJECT - ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL DETAIL AS PER THE MATTERS ARISING

In connection with the Matters Arising entitled “Commercial Project” detailed on the schedule considered earlier in the meeting, the Director of Resources circulated the more detailed cost breakdown as requested by Members previously.

RESOLVED that the information be received and noted.

The meeting concluded at 9.04 pm.

Chairman

Corporate Policy & Resources Committee Matters Arising Schedule

Purpose:

To consider progress on the matters arising from previous Corporate Policy & Resources Committee meetings.

Recommendation: That members note progress on the matters arising and request corrective action if necessary.

Matters arising Schedule

Status	Title	Action Required	Comments	Due Date	Allocated To
Green					
	The Customer First programme	Minute extract 04/04/17, following presentation on Quality Customer Service. "A report would then be submitted to each Committee with a Chief Executive report. A report on the new procedure would be submitted to the July Corporate Policy and Resources Committee, and a workshop would be organised with Parish Councils."	A brief and scope for this work will be considered by the Prosperous Communities Committee at their October meeting. Any financial implications emerging from that report will be brought through to Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for approval.	24/10/17	Mark Sturgess
Black					
	budget consultation software	Extract from mins of meeting 27/7/17	please ensure the final proposed layout is shared with Members in accordance	24/08/17	Katy Allen

		In response Officers indicated that prior to the consultation software going live, they would share the proposed final version with all Members of the Committee in order that they could comment and feedback on issues such as wording and layout.	with the above		
	market income/take up period 1 budget monitoring	Extract from mins of meeting 27/7/17 A Member of the Committee queried why market stall take up appeared to be down and yet income received in this area appeared to be up. In the absence of the Financial Services Manager, the Director of Resources undertook to further investigate and report back to Members outside of the meeting.	Please provide explanation to the above query	14/08/17	Tracey Bircumshaw

	Hillcrest loan agreement	Extract from mins of meeting 27/7/17 the recommendation from the Prosperous Communities Committee be accepted and the proposed Loan Agreement, appended to the report be approved subject to those drafting errors identified and reported to the Committee being amended; and	Please ensure the drafting errors as identified are rectified. personal guarantees to also be considered as part of due diligence	30/08/17	Ian Knowles
--	--------------------------	--	---	----------	-------------

This page is intentionally left blank



**Committee: Corporate
Policy & Resources
Communities**

Date 21st September 2017

Subject: Carbon Efficiency Project

Report by:

Ian Knowles
Director of Resources
01427 675183
ian.knowles@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Contact Officer:

Karen Whitfield
Community Commercial Investment Programmes
Manager
01427 675140
Karen.whitfield@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To update Members with regard to progress on carbon efficiency projects and request the appropriate funding be set aside.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- 1) Members agree to the proposal and that the Capital Budget for this programme be increased to £270,000 with funding from the £127,000 Carbon Reduction Earmarked Reserve already created and the balance of £143,000 to be sourced from prudential borrowing.**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal:

None arising from this report

Financial : FIN/70/2018

The Carbon Management Plan 2016/17 proposed a £100,500 capital investment and a revenue budget of £29,500 to deliver projects estimated to save the Council £7,815 per annum in energy costs.

This revised programme of works will require an approval to increase the capital budget to £270,000, to generate £6,600 p.a, increasing to £35,860 p.a. once the borrowing has been repaid over the initial 5 years.

This investment will be funded from the Carbon Reduction Earmarked Reserve of £127,000, leaving a balance of £0 and £143,000 from prudential borrowing.

Future carbon reduction initiatives will be funded from the Facilities Maintenance Reserve.

This proposal provides a better financial outcome for the Council over the longer term.

Staffing :

There are appropriate resources in place in order to deliver the project.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

None arising from this report.

Risk Assessment :

A full risk assessment has been produced for the project. Identified risks are being proactively managed by the Senior Project Officer and project team.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

The project contains various energy saving initiatives which will save the Council approximately 116,000 kg CO2 per year.

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

None.

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

1 Background

- 1.1 The Council’s 2010 to 2015 Carbon Management Plan originally set a target to reduce the Council’s carbon emissions by 35%. By 2016 an 18% reduction had been achieved.
- 1.2 In July 2016 Corporate Policy and Resources Committee approved the current Carbon Management Plan which covers 2016 to 2021 and sets out a number of projects which will go some way to achieve the remaining 17% target. As part of the report considered Committee also agreed an earmarked reserve of £127,000 be set aside to support the projects therein.
- 1.3 Officers have continued to identify projects that will both reduce carbon emissions and be financially beneficial to the Council.

2 Update on Carbon Projects

2.1 After the previous Energy Officer left in April this year, the Council looked at ways to achieve energy and financial savings on a project basis. Officers therefore commissioned energy surveys on three Council buildings to assess their energy efficiency view a view to identifying energy efficiency works. The buildings surveyed were:

The Guildhall offices
Trinity Arts Centre
The Depot.

2.2 From the surveys undertaken a range of energy saving works have been identified which will also provide financial savings for the Council. These are listed below with indicative costs, carbon savings and financial savings:

Project	Installation Costs	Annual energy savings (kWh/y)	Carbon savings (kgCO2/y)	Cost savings (£/y)
---------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------

TAC lighting replacement	£18,000	20,125	9,042	£2,415
TAC water heater timers	£300	547	246	£68
Depot lighting replacement	£2,000	3,120	1,400	£390
Guildhall lighting replacement	£40,000	57,330	25,759	£7,166
LED street lighting replacement	£210,000	206,565	79,400	£25,821
TOTAL	£270,300	287,687	115,847	£35,860

2.3 Officers have looked at various funding options, including the option of applying for an interest free loan from Salix. Under the terms of the loan the Council would have to pay the initial sum back through the energy savings generated. Therefore, although carbon savings would be made from the start of the project, financial savings would not be realised until after the five year payback period.

2.4 Officers have worked with finance colleagues and have concluded that it would be more advantageous for the Council to fund the improvement works from the £127,000 earmarked reserve and the balance of £143,000 to come from prudential borrowing. This would achieve the same carbon savings but in addition would achieve £6.6k of savings per year for the first five years and then ongoing savings of £35.9k per year thereafter.

2.5 In addition to this there will be savings in terms of ongoing maintenance and bulb replacement.

3 Recommendation

3.1 It is hereby **RECOMMENDED** that Members:

Agree to the proposal to fund these works from the £127,000 earmarked reserve already created and the balance of £143,000 to be sourced from prudential borrowing.



**Committee: Corporate
Policy & Resources
Communities**

Date 21st September 2017

Subject: Commercial Opportunity – Battery Storage

Report by:

Ian Knowles
Director of Resources
01427 675183
ian.knowles@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Contact Officer:

Karen Whitfield
Community Commercial Investment Programmes
Manager
01427 675140
Karen.whitfield@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To update Members with regard to progress on carbon efficiency projects and request the appropriate funding be set aside.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- 1) Members agree to Officers continuing to work on Option 3 detailed in paragraph 3.2 of this report taking into account all procurement and planning considerations, and agree to receive a further report in order to confirm the level of investment required and how this will be sourced at the appropriate time.

IMPLICATIONS

Legal:

The Council has a legal right to form a joint venture company with a private investor.

All procurement regulations will be followed and planning consent would be required

Financial : FIN/69/18

The cost of research and development of the business case has totalled £7k and has been contained within existing budgets.

A capital budget and funding will require approval and this will be subject of a future report, however the business case supports the use of Prudential Borrowing as a means of financing the capital investment.

The table below provides indicative figures with an estimated contribution to the Medium Term Financial Plan savings target of £45,712 (having taken account of the costs of borrowing) annually for 10 and potentially up to 15 years for Option 3.

The project appears to be viable based on current information but this is not without risk. The worst case scenario would be for the Council to lose its initial investment, however, this risk will be fully assessed and brought before Committee as part of final proposals.

Staffing :

There are appropriate resources in place in order to deliver the project if the proposed action is agreed.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

None arising from this report.

Risk Assessment :

A full risk assessment has been produced for the project. Identified risks are being proactively managed by the Senior Project Officer and project team.

RISK: The Government are currently consulting on the revision of battery storage income structures will be reduced (to be applied from April 2019).

MITIGATION: The private sector are lobbying for a 5 year assurances on income streams and rates.

RISK: The National Grid place a constraint of 12 months to deliver the project to completion once they have approved the connection offer.

MITIGATION: Project plan, procurement and appropriate approvals need to be factored into this timeline.

RISK: Capacity to connect to the grid will be taken up in next 18 months.

MITIGATION: Appropriate project planning.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

This project is beneficial in terms of providing solutions to the impending energy difficulties facing the UK

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

None.

Call in and Urgency:**Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?**

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

x

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

x

1 Background

- 1.1 Officers have been continuing to look at ways of using capital resources to generate additional income and have been looking into the potential around the battery storage of electricity. This represents a commercial opportunity for the Council to improve its financial position and help to provide a solution to the imminent power difficulties facing the UK.

- 1.2 The concept is that a connection to the National Grid is made and batteries are subsequently connected. They will have the potential to store electricity when supply is high and release this back to the Grid in times of low supply.
- 1.3 Officers have been working with a group of national Councils together with an expert from Asset Utilities to fully understand the opportunity and potential benefit for West Lindsey District Council. In May Officers attended a meeting held by Gloucestershire County Council when six battery investors presented their financial models for battery storage. This has allowed the Council to develop an indicative business case in order to assess the opportunities and the level of risk attached.
- 1.4 Intelligence from the market place suggests that within the next eighteen months no further grid connections will be granted due to capacity being fully taken up. The National Grid also place a constraint of twelve months after the establishment of a grid connection on the development of the batteries. This means that if we are to go ahead with this project, it has to happen quickly.
- 1.5 The batteries themselves have a warranty of ten years with potential to be fully functional for fifteen years. This gives a project life of ten years, with the potential to extend to fifteen.
- 1.6 The Government recently indicated that they would be reviewing income structures for batteries from 2019.

2. Work Undertaken to Date

- 2.1 A site appraisal has been carried on land already in the Council's ownership to assess whether any of these would be suitable for development.
- 2.2 A total of five budget applications were then made to National Grid to see whether connection was possible. Two sites have proved suitable for development, being the land at the rear of Mercury House in Gainsborough and land down Causeway Lane in Lea.

3. Options

- 3.1 Officers have looked at the options around how to take this project forward. These include:
 - 1) Securing the grid connection and leasing the land to a battery investor directly
 - 2) Developing and managing the battery connections ourselves
 - 3) Forming a joint venture with a battery investor with a percentage split on income and expenditure.

3.2 The table below demonstrates indicative figures on these options:

Financial Analysis	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	Rent Land	100% Invest 100% Rewards	20% Invest 20% Rewards
*Net Annual Inc (-) / Exp	-11,464	-514,548	-90,442
Total Capex	0	1,868,870	432,974
NPV viable/(-) not viable	80,518	1,477,323	140,215
IRR	0.00%	22.00%	13.57%
Pay Back period years	N/A	4.00	6.00
** MTFP (-) contribution	11,464	296,936	45,712

3.3 Whilst selling or leasing the land would provide a return, the greatest financial benefit would come from either developing the sites ourselves or forming a joint venture with a battery investor.

3.4 Taking into account the risks around future income and the lack of expertise within the Council to manage the control and sale of energy, it is not proposed to take forward this option. In addition the lead in time for new batteries would be in excess of 12 months which could result in the National Grid withdrawing their formal offer of connection.

3.5 The recommended option would be for the Council to form a joint venture with a battery investor on an 80/20 basis. This would reduce the Council's risk in terms of capital but still represents an annual income of £90,442 per annum for 10 years, after costs of borrowing this will provide a contribution to the MTFP savings target of £45,712. In addition it may be possible to offset some of the 20% capital required by putting the land into the joint venture. Under this option the land would remain in the ownership of the Council and would be returned to us at the end of the project.

4 Recommendation

4.1 It is hereby **RECOMMENDED** that Members:

Agree to Officers continuing to work on Option 3 detailed in paragraph 3.2 of this report taking into account all procurement and planning considerations, and agree to receive a further report in order to confirm the level of investment required and how this will be sourced at the appropriate time.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Corporate Policy &
Resources**

21 September 2017

Purchase of a replacement Civic vehicle

Report by:

Monitoring Officer

Contact Officer:

Alan Robinson
Monitoring Officer
01427 67509
alan.robinson@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To request Corporate Policy and Resources Committee to agree to release up to £30,000 from the Capital Earmarked Reserves and to delegate authority to the Monitoring officer to negotiate and purchase a replacement Civic vehicle.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- 1) To approve the capital expenditure of up to £30,000 funded from the Civic Earmarked Reserve for the purchase of a replacement Civic vehicle and that delegated authority be granted to the Monitoring Officer to negotiate and purchase such a vehicle.**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None

Financial : FIN/75/18

Members approved within the Capital Programme 2015/16 a budget of £51k for a replacement civic car, funded from Earmarked Reserves £26k and capital receipts £25k. This budget has been carried forward each year.

This report requests up to £30k is approved to spend on the replacement vehicle and this be funded from the Civic Enhancements Earmarked Reserve £26k (the balance on this reserve will be £0) and £4k from Capital Receipts.

The Capital Budget will be revised accordingly.

Staffing : None associated with this report.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights : N/A

Risk Assessment : N/A

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities : None

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Details of journeys and repairs over the last 3 years are contained in appendix 1

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one to which Rule 14 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

Yes

No

Key Decision:

Yes

No

1 Background

- 1.1 The Council provides chauffeur driven transport for the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, former Chairman and honoured guests when attending Civic functions. The council currently own a Jaguar S-Type which is now 10 years old. The Council has had this vehicle for the 10 year period; however, it was leased for the first 5 years;
- 1.2 Civic transport has been reviewed on a number of occasions over the 10 year period;
- 1.3 In 2012 when the lease period came to an end it was not possible to renew the lease. The options were to either return the vehicle or purchase the vehicle. At that time it was decided the most cost effective option was to purchase the vehicle. The vehicle was purchased on a proviso that it would be replaced after a period of three years;
- 1.4 Although the proviso was to replace the vehicle after three years (i.e. in 2015), a further review of Civic transport was carried out in 2014. Whereas a saving had been made since purchasing the vehicle in 2012 the saving was not as substantial as hoped (in 2012). However, it does show that this achieved value for money and the right decision was made to purchase the vehicle rather than to enter into another lease arrangement;
- 1.5 In 2015 £51,000 for the renewal of the Civic car was included in the capital programme, approved as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan. This will be funded from a combination of Civic Earmarked Reserve and capital receipts. This budget has been carried forward annually;

2 Current Position

- 2.1 Consideration is now being given to the replacement of the Civic vehicle. In July Officers consulted with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Chauffeur to come up with a suitable proposal for a new vehicle. Comments were also invited from the Leader and a past Chairman. This considered:
 - The cost of continuing to provide a chauffeur service;
 - Whether to retain or remove the Civic Transport provision;
 - How best to provide Civic transport with officer support;
 - Options to purchase a prestige vehicle both new and used;
 - Options to purchase a suitable vehicle both new and used;
 - Options to lease a prestige vehicle both new and used;
 - Options to lease a suitable vehicle both new and used;

Arising from the discussions the following criteria was established:

- It is important to have a reasonable prestige car which will comfortably accommodate five people on a journey;
- The vehicle does not have to be brand new. A used vehicle with low mileage will be considered;
- In the past rear space and leg room has been an issue. This should be considered when purchasing any replacement vehicle;
- Historically there were benefits to running a diesel vehicle; however, due to the current evidence of the effects of diesel emissions on the climate and health and wellbeing, the stakeholders do not want a diesel vehicle;

2.2 The Civic Earmarked Reserve has £26,000 available for the Civic car replacement;

3 Recommendation

3.1 That Members approve the capital expenditure of up to £30,000 funded from the Civic Earmarked Reserve for the purchase of a replacement Civic vehicle and that delegated authority be granted to the Monitoring Officer to negotiate and purchase such a vehicle.

Appendix 1

Civic vehicle Background

Journeys undertaken in the last three years:

- 2015/2016 101
- 2016/2017 105
- 2017/2018 26

Mileage in the last three years

- 2015/2016 6782
- 2016/2017 7427
- 2017/2018 3424

Repair Bills in the last three years

- 2015/2016 Repairs £484.75 Servicing £228.50 Total £713.25
- 2016/2017 Repairs £214.02 Servicing £534.84 Total £748.86
- 2017/2018 Repairs£1350.25 Servicing £201.84 Total £1552.09

Breakdown of Repairs

2015/2016

04/06/201	£212.00	Coil Spring and drop link
23/06/2015	£162.75	Reversing sensor, Reverse light switch
11/11/2015	£110.00	Replacement of Wheel bearings

2016/2017

02/11/16	£175.68	2 Budget Tyres
28/11/16	£38.34	1 Budget tyre

2017/2018

15/05/17	£33.33	Diagnostic check
15/05/17	£86.64	Tyre and wheel balance
25/05/17	£834.17	Clutch and flywheel
07/08/17	£395.91	Door lock and parking sensor

This page is intentionally left blank

**Committee**

Corporate Policy and
Resources Committee

Date

21 September 2017

Subject: Gainsborough Town Centre Townscape Heritage Application

Report by:

Eve Fawcett-Moralee
Economic and Commercial Growth Director

Contact Officer:

Wendy Osgodby
Senior Growth Strategy and Projects Officer
Direct Dial :01427 676636
wendy.osgodby@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To provide an update on the application to the Heritage Lottery Fund for Townscape Heritage funding for Gainsborough Town Centre, thereby obtaining formal commitment and financial support.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

1. To proceed with the submission of a Stage 1 Townscape Heritage bid.
2. To approve the use of the Investment for Growth Reserve as capital match funding within the application.
3. To approve a revised budget within the Capital Programme as detailed within the financial implications.

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: Any works carried out under the TH scheme will require the owner's consent and statutory consent (in the form of Listed Building Consent). All works will need to be state aid compliant.

Financial : FIN/67/18

Within the Capital Programme 2017/18 there is a budget of £1.717m for the purpose of delivering this scheme, the financing of which was to be £0.429m from the Investment for Growth Reserve and £1.288m from grant.

In accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, this Committee must approve the submission of grant bids, and accept a commitment to approve relevant match funding in support of the bid, in addition to accepting any future ongoing revenue implications.

The Committee are therefore requested to amend the Capital programme to reflect a budget of £1.615m funded by £0.365m from the Investment for Growth Fund and £1.250m from HLF grant funding.

The delivery of this project is dependent on the success of the bid. Approval to spend will therefore be subject of a future report, once the outcome is known and which will contain details of the schemes to be delivered.

At this stage it is not envisaged that there will be any ongoing revenue financial implications.

Staffing :

This project will be led by the Senior Growth Strategy and Projects Officer supported by the Senior Projects Officer and the Growth Team as part of the agreed work plan.

A steering group has been established to act as a coordinating and monitoring body involving local residents, businesses, council representatives, and representatives from the community and voluntary sector.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

The Stage one application form includes a full equalities impact checklist which takes account of the impact of the project upon groups with protected characteristics under the 2010 Equalities Act.

Risk Assessment :

Risk

We are rejected for the THI funding.

Mitigation

We do not consider a third bid for a substantial period of time and reflect on the organisational lessons offered through HLF rejecting the application.

Risk

We fail to accurately evaluate the conservation deficit in the town centre.

Mitigation

Consult with the Conservation Officer on our assumptions about the historic environment of the town centre.

Commission the building character appraisals contained in the 2016 WLDC THI bid to be updated.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

Any new development will ensure that current building regulation standards on sustainability can be achieved and include provision for cyclists.

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Prosperous Communities Committee – 7 June 2016 - Gainsborough
Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI) Bid

<https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-council/decision-making-and-council-meetings/meetings-agendas-minutes-and-reports/prosperous-communities-committee/prosperous-communities-committee-reports/>

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

1 Background

- 1.1 A Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI) is a programme administered by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) which seeks to restore historic (both listed and non-listed) buildings in towns. It is a large award of funds to a lead partner (usually a local authority) who operates, in conjunction with partners, a scheme to restore the historic environment of a specified area. This is largely conducted through offering grants to close the 'conservation deficit' (the higher cost incurred through repairs to heritage assets) which are set at a specified percentage of the cost by the relevant officer. The project usually comes with an associated programme of cultural and educational activities, as well as improvements to the local public realm.
- 1.2 This project represents an exciting opportunity for WLDC to act as the catalyst for the heritage-led regeneration of Gainsborough town centre. This is our chance to save some vital heritage assets in our urban core. The project is an important component of the current programmes associated with the Growth Team and with the Mayflower 400 celebrations (the THI area forms part of the Pilgrim Trail).
- 1.3 WLDC previously submitted an application in 2016 but this was rejected by HLF on the grounds that while it was very technically accomplished, it didn't have the 'value added' required to distinguish it in that round of applications.
- 1.4 HLF have indicated they would welcome a resubmission for Gainsborough town centre, subject to the bid including more additional elements as agreed in a debriefing session.
- 1.5 The council's work with the Joint Venture Company for Market Street and its progress towards acquiring a Development Partner for the riverside area has meant that we have entered a fundamental period in the town's renaissance. WLDC have recently expressed their commitment to heritage-led regeneration through the successful launch of a Heritage Masterplan for Gainsborough and organisationally, we have the skills and expertise to support this. The concentration of designated heritage assets in the town centre and their poor condition still causes cause for concern and having them restored or brought into use by local businesses will support the priority projects currently being undertaken by the Growth Team and others.

2 Progress to date

- 2.1 We have established a diverse steering group to administer the project through to the submission of the bid and then, hopefully, through the development phase if the bid is approved (see attached governance chart). The first group met on the 7th August.

- 2.2 We have established an area geography – Gainsborough Market Place and Lord Street.
- 2.3 We are currently seeking letters of support from key figures to boost the bid.
- 2.4 Bassetlaw District Council have been advising us on the preparation of a successful THI bid (their bid was commended as a model by the HLF).
- 2.5 We have notified all business owners in the area of our intentions and have begun a robust process of consultation. We have received five responses, all of which were highly enthusiastic. This represents a very positive level of engagement within a small sample.
- 2.6 We have had two consultation events (one attended by the MP for Gainsborough). The consultation is taking place in partnership with Gainsborough Town Council and harmony with Neighbourhood Plan process.
- 2.7 We are in the process of commissioning a re-assessment of the condition of the buildings in the area and associated costs.
- 2.8 Currently, we are formulating a programme of cultural and educational activities (working in conjunction with the University of Lincoln and Gainsborough College) to support the bid.
- 2.9 We are currently working on the details of our grant request but it seems highly likely that the amount we will be asking for will be £1.25m. The total scheme being £1.615m with £0.365m being a match funding contribution from the Investment for Growth Reserve.
- 2.10 However, we will endeavour to reduce the scheme (and improve our chances of success), by limiting the amount of public realm works required by the project.

3 Recommendations

- 3.1 To proceed with the submission of a Stage 1 Townscape Heritage bid.
- 3.2 To approve the use of £0.365m of the Investment for Growth Reserve as capital match funding within the application.
- 3.3 To approve the revised budget within the Capital Programme as detailed within the report.

We proceed with the submission of a Stage 1 Townscape Heritage bid and supported by use the previously agreed funds as match funding within the application.

This page is intentionally left blank



Corporate Policy and Resources

Date: 21 September 2017

Subject: Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) – Proposed Funding Bid

Report by:

Eve Fawcett-Moralee & Jo Walker

Contact Officer:

Eve Fawcett-Moralee, Commercial and Economic Growth Director
Mobile: 07890 910178
Email: Eve.Fawcett-Moralee@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Jo Walker, Team Manager Projects and Growth
Tel: 01427 676633
Email: Joanna.walker@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To approve proposals for West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) to submit a funding bid to the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) to support the delivery of housing in Gainsborough as part of the growth programme.

Recommendations:

- 1. To approve the proposal to submit a funding bid to the Housing Infrastructure Fund to support the delivery of housing as part of the growth programme in Gainsborough.**
- 2. To delegate the sign-off of the final funding bid to the S151 Officer, as required by the funding process.**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None as a result of this report. The costs associated with any further legal advice in connection with HIF proposals will be included within the funding bid wherever possible.

Financial: FIN-68-18

In accordance with the Financial Regulations, the grant application is being developed with the service accountant and approval is being sought via Corporate Policy & Resources Committee to submit the funding bid.

At the current time discussions with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) are ongoing.

It is envisaged that the bid could be in the region of £4m with a match funding requirement, which is likely to be provided by the Private Sector and not WLDC.

Once the full bid details are determined and subject to the bid being successful, a capital budget will require the approval of this Committee. This will be presented to at a later date, once the outcome of the bidding process is known.

In line with the financial regulations, the final bid submission must be signed off by the S151 Officer.

Staffing: None as a result of this report. The projects which are the subject of this funding bid are being managed by Growth Team staff as part of their existing remit and under the direction of the Commercial and Economic Growth Director (and Acting Chief Executive). No additional staffing resources are required at this stage.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights: HIF funding will support the delivery of the Growth and Regeneration Plan for Gainsborough. The identified scheme will lead to the delivery of new homes and ultimately new commercial development, jobs and training opportunities. The overall objective is the creation of a self-sustainable and affluent town and constituent community, which provides opportunities for all of its citizens.

Specific programmes for the South West and North Wards will assist in addressing the multiple indices of deprivation, in tandem with the Strategic Partnership in the South West Ward and the Council's Skills programme.

Risk Assessment:

Key Risk: Lack of support for the project

Mitigation:

- Key project already identified as part of growth programme, with planning in place;
- Funding proposals discussed with internal and external stakeholders;
- Funding proposals discussed through the Committee process;

Key Risk: Unable to secure funding

Mitigation

- Staff involved in bidding process have extensive experience in bid-writing and have already secured £7m in the past 2 years;
- Further support towards the bidding process from external partners;
- Project selected based on strategic fit, value for money (VFM) and deliverability in accordance with funding criteria to offer best chance of success;

Key Risk: Unable to deliver project due to issues such as land ownership, lack of owner support, lack of developer interest, planning

- Project selected on basis of strategic fit/VFM and also based on ability to deliver quickly;
- Project has support of external partners;

Key Risk: Project costs higher than original estimates/amount available through bidding process

- Project costs informed by detailed and robust technical work;
- Final project costs will be based on full procurement/tender process to accord with requirements of the bidding process. This will form part of post-decision due diligence phase;

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities: Any new development will satisfy current building regulation standards on sustainability can be achieved and provision for cyclists and sustainable transport is included. The programme will deliver a critical mass of population to ensure Gainsborough's future sustainability.

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Gainsborough Development Partner Committee Reports:

- Prosperous Communities: July, October 2016; February, July 2017
- Corporate Policy and Resources: July, October 2016; February, July 2017

GLLEP Business Plan Proposals

- Prosperous Communities & CPR: June 2017

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules applies?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

X

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

X

1 Housing Infrastructure Fund: An Overview

1.1 The Housing Infrastructure Fund is a government capital grant programme of up to £2.3 billion, which will help to deliver up to 100,000 new homes in England. It follows the publication of the Housing White Paper and will help to deliver the government's ambitions in respect of house-building targets.

1.2 Specifically, the Fund will:

- Deliver new physical infrastructure to support communities. Infrastructure can include:
 - Transport and travel
 - Utilities
 - Schools, community, heritage and healthcare
 - Land assembly
 - Digital communications
 - Green infrastructure – parks, green corridors
 - Blue infrastructure – flood defences, sustainable urban drainage (SUDs)
- Make more land available for housing
- Support local authorities who want to step up their plans for growth
- Enable local authorities to recycle the funding for infrastructure projects to help deliver more homes in the future

1.3 Two funding strands are available under this programme:

Marginal Viability Funding

- infrastructure funding to unblock housing sites where the cost of building the infrastructure and homes is too great. This strand will consider funding to support the final or missing piece of infrastructure funding to make schemes viable;
- up to £10m per bid;
- single and lower tier local authorities can apply – West Lindsey District Council is therefore eligible to apply under this strand;

Forward Funding

- For strategic and high impact schemes, this strand will consider upfront infrastructure costs to give market confidence to provide further investment and deliver new development;
- Up to £250m per bid;
- single and upper tier (or combined authorities) can apply – Lincolnshire County Council is therefore eligible to apply under this strand;
- Authorities are encouraged to work together with their Local Enterprise Partnerships in order to develop strong bids;

1.4 Funding bids must be submitted by 28th September 2017 and must be able to spend by 2020/21. All bids must be signed off by the S151 Officer. Funding awards will be announced late 2017/early 2018.

1.5 All bids must support the delivery of an up-to-date plan and have local support. Bids will be assessed based on how well they address the following criteria:

- **Strategic Fit:** strong leadership, joint working, focus on delivering higher levels of housing growth with strong supporting evidence
- **VFM:** demonstrating good value in terms of benefit-cost ratio (in accordance with DCLG appraisal)
- **Deliverability:** bids need to show that there is a clear plan to deliver the infrastructure and a clear link between the provision of infrastructure and the delivery of homes with strong partnership working.

1.6 Further advice has also been provided by the HCA to clarify bid requirements as follows:

- Funding must support the direct delivery of housing, with an emphasis on delivery within the next 3 years, and on large-scale housing schemes;
- Planning permission and a development partner should be in place;

- 50% of the assessment will be on VFM, with an emphasis on land value uplift and a good benefit-cost ratio;
- Bids for Marginal Viability should focus on either one single piece of infrastructure to unlock homes on a specific site, or can include multiple pieces of infrastructure to unlock homes in a specific location. Where several housing sites are included, there must be a common infrastructure requirement, which will serve to unlock housing across all sites (e.g. a new road/utilities provision). infrastructure which will unlock housing on one or more housing sites;
- To date, 150 bids have been registered nationally, of which 2/3 are for Marginal Viability Funding. Approximately 40 of these relate to schemes in the Midlands area. Competition for funds is therefore very strong and there is a need to focus on those schemes which can achieve the best VFM within the required delivery timeframe;

2. Proposals for West Lindsey

- 2.1 It is proposed to submit a bid for funding to support the delivery of housing in Gainsborough, as part of our housing-led Growth Strategy, under the Marginal Viability Funding stream;
- 2.2 Officers have considered a range of potential schemes which could be eligible for funding via HIF and have assessed these in terms of the VFM criteria, deliverability and strategic fit. These schemes have also been considered in respect of the wider growth programme and existing funds which have been secured via the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership (GLLEP) and WLDC's Capital Programme.
- 2.3 As a result of this process and in discussion with stakeholders at the HCA and Lincolnshire County Council, Officers propose to focus the bid on the infrastructure which is required to unlock Gainsborough's largest housing site – the Southern Sustainable Urban Extension. This site benefits from Outline Planning Permission, granted in 2011, but development has stalled. Officers are exploring whether this is due to the infrastructure (particularly the off-site highways improvements) which is required to unlock the first phase of development and whether support via HIF would assist in expediting delivery.
- 2.4 It is considered that such a bid could present a strong case for funding in terms of the scale of development which is proposed; the fact that there is a clear link between infrastructure and unlocking homes; and the VFM this will give in terms of land uplift. It is however, subject to further agreement on the scope of works and presenting a sound business case and rational for funding.
- 2.5 Support for unlocking this major development site (which is critical to the growth programme and housing targets for the town, and wider Central Lincolnshire area), will complement the Council's town centre regeneration programme, which focusses on the renewal of brownfield sites for commercial and residential development, using funds secured through the GLLEP.

- 2.6 When combined, these interventions will help to address the viability challenge and development constraints within the town in order to increase the pace of delivery both in qualitative and quantitative terms.
- 2.7 It is not envisaged that any WLDC funding will be required to support this funding bid as officers will be looking to identify opportunities for match funding from the private sector and other external sources.
- 2.8 A capital budget will require approval if the bid is successful.

3. Next Steps and Recommendations:

- 3.1 Officers will develop the above proposals further, in consultation with colleagues at LCC and the GLLEP, and with other internal/external stakeholders.
- 3.2 It is proposed that Members acknowledge the work done to date on this bid and support Officers in developing a full and final bid for support under this programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Policy & Resources Committee Work Plan

Purpose:

This report provides a summary of reports that are due on the Forward Plan over the next 12 months for the Corporate Policy & Resources Committee.

Recommendation:

1. That members note the schedule of reports.

Date	Title	Lead Officer	Purpose of the report
09/11/2017	Market Rasen Car Parking	Eve Fawcett-Moralee	To provide an update on the impact of introducing car parking charges in Market Rasen
	Body Worn Cameras	Andy Gray	To present options to introduce the use of body worn cameras for WLDC staff. Body worn cameras would be used to protect staff, provide reassurance and obtain evidential footage.
	The Customer First Programme	Mark Sturgess	To set out the new procedures
	P AND D PERIOD 2	Mark Sturgess	To present p and d progress as at end of quarter 2
	Discretionary Rate Relief Policy share of £300m	Alison McCulloch	For members to approve a scheme for the distribution of discretionary rate relief from the £300m offered to local authorities by the Government in the Spring Budget
	Period 2 Budget and Treasury Monitoring	Tracey Bircumshaw	To provide forecast out turn position, approve any new budgets or approval to spend capital.
	Draft Fees and Charges 2018/19 - CP&R	Tracey Bircumshaw	To review and recommend to Council the Fees and Charges 2018/19
	Discretionary Rate Relief Policy Review - Charity	Alison McCulloch	To review the Discretionary Rate Relief Policy for charity and non-profit making organisations
	Medium Term Financial Strategy Mid-Year Update	Tracey Bircumshaw	To provide Members with an update of the Medium Term Financial Plan and future assumptions
	'Living over A Shop' project - Pilot	Wendy Osgodby	To obtain approval to fund the Living Above A Shop Pilot prior to the funding being claimed from the GLLEP.
Being scoped	Managed Workspace: Revised Proposal	Joanna Walker	Seeks member support for a revised proposal for managed workspace on an alternative site in Saxilby.

14/12/2017	Review Disciplinary Rules Procedure	Emma Redwood	To review and update the Disciplinary Rules Procedure for the council
	Review of Flexi-Time Policy	Emma Redwood	To review the council's Flexi-Time policy and update accordingly
	Review the Relocation Policy	Emma Redwood	To review the Council's Relocation Policy
	Write Offs	Alison McCulloch	To write off any Council Tax, Business Rates, Housing Benefit Overpayments and Sundry Debtor accounts that are irrecoverable and over £1500
	Local Council Tax Support Scheme 2018/19	Alison McCulloch	To determine the local council tax support scheme for 2018/19
	Decision on Future Delivery of Garden Waste	Ady Selby	To make a decision regarding the future delivery of the garden waste service, following consultation.
11/01/2018	Leisure Contract Procurement	Karen Whitfield	To update Members on the conclusion of the leisure contract procurement exercise and to approve the preferred contractor
08/02/2018	p and d period 3	Mark Sturgess	to present p and d position as at end of q3
	Period 3 Budget and Treasury Monitoring	Tracey Bircumshaw	To update members on forecast out-turn position and request approval for new budgets or approval to spend capital
	Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/19 to 2022/23	Tracey Bircumshaw	To approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy and the 2018/19 Revenue and Capital Budget and Treasury Management Strategy
10/05/2018	p and d - period 4	Mark Sturgess	to present the year end position for p and d
14/06/2018	Period 4 Budget and Treasury Monitoring	Tracey Bircumshaw	To update members on forecast out-turn and to gain approval of new budgets and capital expenditure
Grand Total			

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank