

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