

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Tuesday 31 January 2017 commencing at 6.30pm.

Present:

Councillor Sheila Bibb (Chairman) (In the Chair)
Councillor Gillian Bardsley (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Steve England – Vice-Chairman
Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
Councillor Jessie Milne
Councillor Di Rodgers
Councillor Lesley Rollings
Councillor Tom Smith
Councillor Trevor Young

In Attendance:

Mark Sturgess	Chief Operating Officer
Ian Knowles	Director of Resources
Alan Robinson	Monitoring Officer
Eve Fawcett-Moralee	Economic and Commercial Growth Director
James O’Shaughnessy	Interim Strategic Lead – Transformation
Karen Whitfield	Community Commercial Investment Programmes Manager
Marina Di Salvatore	Economic Development Growth Project Officer
Tracey Bircumshaw	Financial Services Team Manager
Katie Coughlan	Governance and Civic Officer

Also in Attendance: One Member of the Public – Mr Steve Taylor

Apologies: Councillor Malcolm Parish

Membership: No substitutes were appointed for the meeting

69 CHAIRMAN’S WELCOME AND WITHDRAWAL OF REPORT

The Chairman opened the meeting, welcoming everyone present, including the member of the public who would address the Committee, during the public

participation section of the Meeting. The Chairman invited her Vice-Chairman, Councillor Steve England, in his capacity as Member Champion for Neighbourhood Planning to address the Committee and the following announcement was made: -

Following advice from the Saxilby Neighbourhood Plan examiner and WLDC Officers, it has been agreed that the Saxilby Neighbourhood Plan Report (agenda item 6a) be withdrawn, for consideration by Elected Members, at this evening's Committee. This is to allow appropriate time for Officers to consider a number of issues resulting from the examination. It was proposed that the report would be submitted to the March meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee for consideration.

The Committee noted the position.

70 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Chairman welcomed Mr Steve Taylor to the meeting and invited him to address the Committee. The following statement was made: -

I am sure that this Committee is working hard to ensure Prosperous Communities throughout the district. And throughout the district many people are voluntarily working hard to ensure this too.

Unfortunately we are all being hampered by the West Lindsey Prosperous Communities Prevention Department – otherwise known as Planning.

This service has diverted a £30,000 charitable donation destined to Scothern Village Hall and has failed to organise s106 monies toward community facilities from willing developers. Support for planning obligation monies towards community facilities is legal, in accordance with guidance and lots of other Councils do it.

This failure to provide community facilities for communities taking new homes development is costing communities dear – both in terms of the money they should be getting from planning obligations and then the grant of monies this would pump prime.

This could amount to hundreds of thousands of pounds per community- valuable grant aid that this District would not otherwise access. Grant aid which we know is scarce in this area – hence why we get less than the UK average.

So how are these Planning Officers making Prosperous Communities? Aren't Planning Officers undoing all the good you do?

Councillors, this issue needs to be grabbed, not talking to us isn't the answer. We, like you, want to see prosperous sustainable communities which people want to live in. But we do need to look to our elected representatives to correct the

ongoing wrong based upon an erroneous approach by Planning Officers who seem to think that the answer now is to create a wall of silence.

I ask this Committee to look into this so that your work is not in vain and I look forward to your support in getting community facilities supported. After all, if you don't get developers to support these facilities – we will expect the District Council to find the money. Surely a no cost option is preferable in these cash strapped times? And surely this is the way to make prosperous communities around the district?

Finally Chairman, can I ask for a reassurance that I will receive a specific response from this Committee to my specific statement and question raised tonight.

Thank you.”

The Chairman thanked Mr Taylor for his question and asked the Chief Operating Officer to address Mr Taylor's closing point.

Committee were advised that Mr Taylor would be posing a series of similar, yet differing questions to a range of the Council's meetings over the coming weeks. It was therefore intended to provide Mr Taylor with a single response to all the questions, once they had all been put. Assurance was offered that all the points raised would be addressed in this single response.

Whilst Members were accepting of this, there were some who were of the view that the issue raised warranted not just an Officer response but a Member response also. The Chief Operating Officer advised that this was not a matter for debate by the Committee that evening. It was important that Members had available to them, all relevant information relating to S106s and as such it had been agreed with the Chairman that a S106 monitoring report would be submitted to the Committee early in the new civic year and as such would be debated at that time.

Opposition Members welcomed the questions and were of the view it raised some important issues for rural communities, they welcomed the opportunity to further debate of this matter, and the points Mr Taylor had raised, at a future meeting.

In responding further, Officers indicated that the legal matters, and issues raised in the questions, could also be included within the report. Officers further welcomed Mr Taylor to be present for that debate.

Some Members suggested the matter could be referred to the Challenge an Improvement Committee. However as the Chairman of that Committee was present he indicated, in the first instance the matter should be looked at by the Policy Committee, if after such time Members were not content, this may be something that could be looked at, but he was confident this route would not be required.

Reference was also made to the work being undertaken by the Governance and Audit Committee, and it was further suggested by a Member that this could be incorporated. The Chairman advised the point would be noted.

Mr Taylor was again thanked for his question.

71 MINUTES

- (a) Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee – 6 December 2016.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on 6 December 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

72 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE SETTING OUT THE CURRENT POSITION OF PREVIOUSLY AGREED ACTIONS AS AT 23 JANUARY 2017 (PRCC.44 16/17)

Members gave consideration to the Matters Arising Schedule which set out the current position of all previously agreed actions as at 23 January 2017.

RESOLVED that progress on the Matters Arising Schedule, as set out in report PRCC.36 16/17 be received and noted.

73 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 6 (c) (Food and Farming LDO) as one of the land owners was a serving District Councillor.

Councillor Jessie Milne sought advice regarding her position in relation to agenda items 6 (c) (Food and Farming LDO) and 8 (a) (Sun Inn and Joint Venture Company) in light of that she was also a serving Member of the Planning Committee.

In responding the Chief Operating Officer advised that pre-determination rules had become more liberal in recent years, and as long as Members kept an open mind and stated such when considering the Planning Application, their position was sound. It was suggested that at any future Planning Committee, affected Members should state that they had debated the matter at the Policy Committee, but still had an open mind and would listen to the debate and make their decision based on this.

Councillors Tom Smith and Owen Bierley declared a personal interest in agenda items 6 (c) (Food and Farming LDO) and 6 (e) (Monitoring of Festivals – Market Rasen and Caistor) as both were Members of the Planning Committee and Ward Members respectively.

Councillor Mick Devine declared a personal interest in agenda items 6 (c) (Food and Farming LDO) and 8 (a) (Sun Inn and Joint Venture Company) as a Member of the Planning Committee.

Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan declared a personal interest in agenda items 6 (c) (Food and Farming LDO) as the Local Ward Member for Hemswell, and a personal interest in agenda item 6 (e) (Monitoring of Festivals – Market Rasen and Caistor) as a serving Member of the Leisure, Culture, Tourism and Events Working Group.

74 TO PRESENT THE CORPORATE PLAN (2016-2020) ACTION PLAN UPDATE (PRCC.46 16/17)

Consideration was given to a report which presented Members with details of key strategic activity in progress in support of delivery of the objectives of the Corporate Plan (2016-2020).

To ensure transparency and the publicising of the work the Council had undertaken and was involved with, a summary publication would be produced for issue to partners and the public.

Members were asked to note the key achievements during 2016/17 in support of the Corporate Plan.

Some Members welcomed the report and felt it clearly demonstrated the positive contribution the Council was making and the value it placed on partnership working. The notion of Devolution was still very much supported giving the increasing financial restraints. The contribution of the Community Grant Schemes was considered invaluable and consideration should be given as to how we would continue to support our communities, when current funding allocations had been depleted. It was acknowledged that opportunities might arise through Section 106 and CIL once the Local Plan was adopted. However, such monies would only become available once development had commenced and it was important the communities themselves led on how funds were allocated.

Clarification was sought as to whether some of the projects included within the report had been agreed by the Committee, or whether in principle decisions had been made, examples cited included the purchase of two properties on Market Street, and 5 – 7 Market Place. Some Members questioned the Value for Money of these schemes and requested a report back on such. Reference was made to properties on Stanley Street and again the value for money was questioned. In response Officers advised the two properties related to the Joint Venture proposal that would be considered later in the evening. In principle agreement had been given by the Committee in September 2016 and the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee in October 2016. It was acknowledged the wording could have been better. The project relating to the Market Place property was funded from planned maintenance on a rolling programme approved by the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee and ensured the Council met its obligations as

both a landlord and to its assets. It was acknowledged that the associated costs were high and these were being reviewed, assurance was offered that a raft of activity was underway to ensure value for money could be achieved and there was interest in the property. Details were unavailable regarding the Stanley Street properties and the Economic and Commercial Growth Director undertook to provide information to the Member concerned.

At the request of a Member the Chief Operating Officer clarified how CIL funding would be allocated, stressing that those areas that had an approved Neighbourhood Plan would be entitled to 25% of monies generated in their area and this could amount to a considerable sum, which would be available to the Parish Council.

The relevance of some of the themes were questioned, including the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. In response Officers advised that once adopted it would set the targets for growth and as such was very relevant to progress the Council achieved. Neighbourhood Planning was also contained within that theme and was still very much relevant.

The layout on the whole was welcomed however some Members felt the success of some of the projects listed relied heavily on, and were underpinned by, broadband provision and access across the District being improved, and as such should be more prevalent within the document as a focus. It was felt that progress to date in this area had been limited. Assurance was offered that work in this area was continuing and ongoing but it was a complex and fragmented picture. Its underpinning nature was acknowledged and dual hatted Members offered their services to help in any way possible.

RESOLVED that the key activity detailed within the report which would facilitate the delivery of the objectives of the Corporate Plan be supported and noted.

75 FOOD AND FARMING LDO (PRCC.47 16/17)

Consideration was given to a report which proposed that West Lindsey District Council made a Local Development Order (LDO) to support and encourage development related to the Food Enterprise Zone (FEZ) at Hemswell Cliff, Lincolnshire. An LDO was a tool to simplify the planning requirements for development within a defined area for defined parameters.

The Central Lincolnshire Food and Enterprise Zone Local Development Order (LDO) sought to capitalise on the opportunities associated with the existing businesses/premises at Hemswell Cliff and the availability of adjacent land to support the development of an 'agri-food cluster' located within the A15 growth corridor.

The purpose of an LDO was to simplify and speed up the planning process by providing certainty about the types of development which would be permitted

within a specific area, and reducing the potential risks associated with the formal planning process, encouraging development to come forward in the area.

The LDO would facilitate development of new premises and facilities for businesses in the agri-food sector, thereby providing a location for new and expanding businesses and encouraging inward investment. Investment in the agri-food sector in this location would also contribute to the Council's regeneration and socio-economic objectives through the creation of employment opportunities and integration with the existing businesses and residential areas of Hemswell Cliff.

Officers summarised to Members the types of development which would and would not be permitted, these were contained in Section 2.2 of the report. The potential employment opportunities the project presented were also shared with Members. A full environmental impact assessment had also been undertaken.

The Local Ward Member welcomed the proposals and indicated it had the full backing of the local Parish Council. It was hoped it would act as a trigger and catalyst for further development and growth in the Parish.

In response to questions, Officers re-affirmed that the types of business which would be acceptable would not be of an offensive nature. Impact on the community and environment had, and would be, a high consideration. However the LDO would not supersede the usual planning application process, and such companies would still be permitted to make an application. Linking local communities to local produce was also an important part of the project and Officers were considering ways in which this shared aspiration could be delivered, a number of these were outlined.

Debate ensued and Members questioned what the position would be if grant funding was not secured. It was confirmed that a capital allocation of £500k had been agreed by the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee. Any further financing from the Council would be subject to an appropriate business case to do so, which would also need approval from the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee. Officers had applied for some funding through the GLLEP and the outcome would be known later in February 2017. The project would also be looked at from a commercial aspect by the Council.

It was further confirmed that initial desktop ground condition assessments had been undertaken as part of the environmental impact assessment. Whilst some potential effects have been identified at this stage, effective implementation and risk mitigation measures had been secured by LDO conditions and would have to be agreed prior to the commencement of development. Officers indicated that they would be happy to share the full assessment with Committee Members.

RESOLVED that the Central Lincolnshire Food and Enterprise Zone Local Development Order (LDO) be endorsed prior to public consultation

**76 STRATEGIC TRANSPORT MODEL AND DEVELOPMENT STUDY
(PRCC.47 16/17)**

Consideration was given to a report which sought support to procure a strategic transport model in the Gainsborough urban area for the purpose of promoting sustainable growth through improving traffic flows within the town whilst also maintaining connectivity from Nottinghamshire and South Yorkshire into the District, safeguarding the economic benefits to West Lindsey of the primary routes to Scunthorpe, Lincoln and the coast.

The need for this work and the benefits it could afford the District were outlined in detail to the Committee. It was noted neighbouring authorities such as NKDC had already invested in such a model and were now benefitting from funding assistance to their infrastructure aspirations. The study would enable the Council to put itself in a similar position and thus be able to access required monies.

Officers advised that following a Corporate Policy and Resources Chair's Briefing, they had been requested to reconsider the funding of this Study and as such if Members were minded to support the proposals it would not be submitted to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee until such time as alternative funds had been sourced. As such an in principle decision subject to funding was now being sought and it would be for the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee to agree how to fund the project.

In light of this, and on the advice of Officers the second recommendation, which related to the funding of this work, was removed.

On that basis it was: -

RESOLVED that the need for the procurement of the Strategic Transport Model and Development Study be acknowledged.

**77 MONITORING OF FESTIVALS – MARKET RASEN AND CAISTOR
(PRCC.50 16/17)**

Consideration was given to report which sought to update Members regarding the Wolds Arts Festival and future tourism work. The report advised of the time limited funds which had been allocated to this work and assessed the impact the events had had on the local community.

The report advised that whilst the event was a great success and enjoyed by those attending, the cost of producing the Festival was not matched by economic impact over the two areas. In addition, as 82% of the audiences were from the local

catchment group, the Festival did not produce a large number of visits from outside the District. For these reasons it was being recommended that, given current financial constraints and the other emerging priorities detailed in the report, including the Mayflower 400, further provision of stand-alone events be not supported and no further resources be allocated in this regard.

Members felt it was still important for the authority to invest in the arts and culture but in a very much more enabling way. Volunteers desperately needed professional support in making grant applications, health and safety applications and leadership, if community events were to be successful. This was where it was felt the Council could still play a vital role in enabling, but a more sustainable approach was required.

Members also mentioned the support the authority had offered to North Lincolnshire, through the Devolution work, in seeking a review to the Wolds AONB, with a view to extending it to the Humber, which would further complement the tourist offer available in this District. An update was sought and the Chief Operating Officer undertook to contact the County Commissioner for the Environment to ascertain progress to date and would update the Committee through the matters arising report.

The enabling vision was shared across the Committee but some Members felt the Authority needed to aspire more.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) the evaluation results of the Wolds Arts Festival be noted and no further funding be set aside to support the provision of stand alone events; and
- (b) Officers continue to work and support other emerging Tourism opportunities within the District and that this work continue to be monitored by the Leisure Culture Tourism and Events Working Group.

78 PROGRESS AND DELIVERY PERIOD 3 (PRCC.51 16/17)

The report was introduced by the Chief Operating Officer who noted that it reflected the performance of the Council in the first nine months of the 2016/17 municipal year (April – December).

The 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 for next year's report.

Areas described as performing well included: Building Control; Development Management; Projects and Growth; and the Trinity Arts Centre.

Those areas described as risks included: Local Land Charges; Enforcement; Markets; and Home Choices.

Further information was given on each of the above. Data relating to Complaints, Comments and Compliments were being reconsidered to present a more sophisticated way of monitoring. A measure around section 106s and CIL was also to be introduced to give members greater visibility.

Discussion ensued and a Member sought assurance that when planning applications alluded to economic growth, the Growth Team should be included as consultees and that link made and embedded. Officers advised that this was the case, however if the Member had a differing experience, they would be happy to discuss this outside of the meeting.

A Member made further enquiries regarding the under-performance in car parking income and sought to ascertain why the finance team had been unable to offer any explanation within the report. There was a view that the current Car Parking Strategy was failing Gainsborough. It was suggested that income was down, as people could no longer find a parking space.

In responding, the Financial Services Manager asked Members to recall that the Car Parking Strategy had stated there was limited evidence available as to what to base the charges on, furthermore the impact of the loss of the multi-storey and the introduction of charges in Market Rasen would be unknown and would need to be factored in at some point in the future. The quarter 3 Monitoring Report due for consideration by the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee on 9 February 2017, did advise, and provide details, of budget pressures relating to car parking income for a number of reasons including the delay in introducing charges in the Market Rasen, in order to support businesses through the Christmas period. Income from car parking permits had increased and pressure of around £39k was being reported.

Some Member considered the Strategy was just not working, permits were up and yet income in general was down. A Council priority was to be open for business and this Strategy just did not support it.

The Chief Operating Officer responded advising that he had been liaising closely with the Chairman regarding issues the Council were aware currently existed and those which were likely to arise in the future. The Car Parking Strategy for Gainsborough needed to be reviewed, and a further report would be submitted to the Committee in March 2017. The report would look at a raft of things including the financial position and pricing of permits but also opportunities for additional car parks around the town. Some work had been undertaken to date and approximately 70 council staff had been relocated to the Tesco overspill car-park, freeing up spaces nearer the town centre, however it was acknowledged that further work was required.

Members welcomed the positive position in terms of Enforcement, and the continued success being realised by the Trinity Arts Centre. Concern was expressed that the situation in respect of homelessness would only continue.

Returning to concerns relating to the car park income, Members shared their experiences of having tried to park in the town centre recently and expressed disappointment that the original Strategy's driver appeared to have been cost. Feedback from residents was that they could not get to their streets as the parking situation was having an impact and it had been suggested that this was Council Staff. There was a view that the Council needed to make parking easier and closer to the shops if it really wanted to support businesses. Expectation now dictated people wanted to park close and shop instantly and a cost neutral driver would never deliver this.

The interim work undertaken with regard to staff parking was reiterated. The revised arrangements could, and would, be enforced against essential car users, at a total of 59. However staff "paid for permits" / casual users were issued permits at the same cost as to residents, and staff which had agreed to relocate had done this out of good will.

Some Members were of the view that a radical review of how enforcement was carried out was required and welcomed indication that more resources would be put into this area.

RESOLVED that having reviewed the performance information contained in the Progress and Delivery Report, the report be accepted.

79 REVENUE BASE BUDGETS 2017/2018 (PRCC.52 16/17)

Members gave consideration to a report which set out details of the Committee's draft revenue estimates for the period 2017/18 – 2021/22.

The process for preparing the budget was shared with Members and detailed at Section 1.3 of the report. The major variances when compared to the 2016/17 base budget and the reasons for these were also shared with Members and were detailed in Section 2 of the report.

In conclusion the Committee were asked to note that the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee, at their meeting on 15 December 2016, when considering the Committee's recommendations relating to Fees and Charges had resolved to remove the burial charges for children under 12 years old and had suggested that the proposed uplift of 130% be delivered over two financial years. Further information was contained in Section 3 of the report.

RESOLVED that the draft Prosperous Communities budget for 17/18 be **RECOMMENDED** to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee for inclusion in the Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 – 2021/22

80 WORK PLAN (PRCC.53 16/17)

Members gave consideration to the Committee work plan.

It was confirmed that the two additional items, referenced throughout the meeting, namely, A Section 106 Monitoring Report and the Review of the Car Parking Strategy would be incorporated into the Work Plan.

RESOLVED that the Work Plan as set out in report PRCC.42 16/17, subject to the two additions referenced above, be received and noted.

81 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.

82 SUN INN RE-DEVELOPMENT- FUNDING AGREEMENT AND MARKET STREET REGENERATION – JOINT VENTURE PROPOSAL, GAINSBOROUGH (PRCC.54 16/17)

In September/October 2016 both Prosperous Communities and Corporate Policy and Resources Committees agreed in principle to:

- (a) a capped grant to enable the delivery of hotel and restaurant, and
- (b) to the creation of a joint venture company.

In doing so Members acknowledged that securing a hotel in Gainsborough would have a significant and positive economic impact on the town; and with regard to the joint venture company the strong rationale as summarised below:

- DPL/NSGL ownership of the adjacent property required to deliver a hotel;
- DPL matching funding with the Council's equity share investment;
- DPL's track record of delivering successful regeneration in the town;
- enabling the Council to deliver key regeneration objectives and generate potential commercial return to the Council.

In short, both projects would accelerate the physical and economic regeneration of the town centre. Officers at that time had been delegated to negotiate and prepare a Grant Funding Agreement (GFA), Joint Venture Agreement (JVA) and Articles of Association in line with the Heads of Terms agreed by these committees.

When first considering these proposals Members stressed the importance of securing high quality development and the need to maximise the environmental and regenerative impact of the projects to be commensurate with the level of Council support. In response to this Officers had worked up the Joint Venture Agreement, and Articles of Association to incorporate a wider area of benefit, to include Market, North and Church Streets and Market Place.

The Council and its commercial advisors had continued to work on an “open book” basis with DPL to scrutinise the cost and value of the hotel. A detailed scheme had been worked up and would form a planning application to be submitted to a future meeting of the Planning Committee.

Officers had augmented and quantified the business case to support the redevelopment of the hotel and restaurant, and Joint Venture Company through a bespoke economic impact assessment undertaken by an independent specialist 31TEN.

Further specialist legal advice had been taken in developing these proposals specifically with regards to State Aid and procurement, in addition to in-house legal advice, which had appraised the final suite of agreements to implement the recommendations. These Agreements followed the Heads of Terms Members agreed in September/October 2016 and provided a robust basis to manage the release of the Council’s funding, delivery of outputs and ensure value for money.

Debate ensued and Members expressed their concerns at the press release contained in the Gainsborough Standard on 19 January despite the Council having only made an in principle agreement. There was a view that had Members released the content of the proposals prior to a final decision, they would have been reprimanded. It was also questioned whether Planning Members had been compromised.

Officers offered their apologies and confirmed it was not a Council press release, the event had been a community consultation event around the planning application. Regardless, Members were of the view that arrangements should have been put in place to ensure that there was no media cover prior to the decision being made. Members had been put in a difficult position when faced with questions from residents and the article had the potential to damage the Council’s reputation without having put the potential loan arrangement into some wider context.

In responding to concerns, it was acknowledged that as with any project there was a risk, however the GFA had been drafted to include provisions which protected the Council in the event of non-performance or a breach of the terms of the GFA by NSGL the wholly owned subsidiary of DPL. There were also safeguards should the venture prove more successful than envisaged, the Council would share in these profits. These protections were outlined in detail to the Committee. It was stressed that this was in no way a soft loan and the private developer was considered to be carrying more risk. The provisions contained with the arrangements were tighter than any applied by European Funding. The project as a whole was a huge social and economic enabler and would deliver some key features the town was crying out for.

The S151 Officer offered further reassurance that he and the Monitoring Officer had looked at the proposal independently to ensure the Council's funding was safeguarded as far as possible and that the Council's interests were protected. The viability gap alleged by the developer had also been independently tested.

The Chief Operating Officer re-iterated his previous advice regarding Members of the Planning Committee and their position.

In responding to concerns that design and quality needed to be fitting, Officer reiterated that proposals would be subject to same planning requirements as any other application. This was a prime site and the developer would be obliged to meet certain legal requirements, if planning permission were to be granted, as would any development in that area. Members were reminded that this was part of the decision they were being asked to make and this was the responsibility of the Planning Committee. Visiting Members would be permitted at the Committee and would be able to submit consultation responses as with any planning application.

No funding would be released until such time as planning permission had been granted.

Following much discussion it was:

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the Council enters into a Grant Funding Agreement (in the form attached as appendix 1 to report PRCC.54 16/17), to enable the redevelopment of the Sun Inn to a new 56 bedroom hotel with an independent ground floor restaurant;
- (b) the Council becomes a member of Market Street Renewal Limited (a 50/50 joint venture company with DPL to facilitate the regeneration of Market, Church and North Streets and Market Place area) by subscribing for shares in the company in accordance with the Joint Venture Agreement, Articles of Association and associated company formation documents in the form attached at Appendix 2 of report PRCC.54 16/17.

- (c) the Council enters into the Joint Venture Agreement, and the Shareholders Loan Agreement (in the form attached as appendix 2 to report PRCC.54 16/17) to form, finance and govern the operation of “Market Street Renewal Limited”
- (d) it be **RECOMMENDED** to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee that the release of the requisite funding set out in recommendations 1 2 and 3 above and to include a capped grant of up to £1,400,000 to NSGL, pursuant to the GFA, and loan funding of £250,000 pursuant to a Shareholders Loan Agreement to Market Street Renewal Limited, be approved
- (e) it be **RECOMMENDED** to the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee that the sale of the Council’s long leasehold interest in two commercial properties into Market Street Renewal Limited at market value, subject to a business case and in compliance with the Council’s Disposal Policy, be approved
- (f) the Commercial and Economic Growth Director plus one other officer or independent, be appointed as Directors of Market Street Renewal Limited and approve that the Council enters into the Deed of Indemnity (in the form attached as appendix 3 to report PRCC.54 16/17) in respect of each such appointee.
- (g) the Director of Resources be appointed to represent the Council as the shareholder in Market Street Renewal Limited.
- (h) the Chief Executive be granted delegated authority, following consultation with Chairmen of Corporate Policy and Resources and Prosperous Communities Committees to take such decisions and execute such documents as shall give effect to the above decisions.

Note: Councillor Smith voted against the above proposals and requested that this be recorded.

The meeting concluded at 9.08 pm.

Chairman