



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 758307 DX 28340 Oakham

Record of a meeting of the **PLACES SCRUTINY PANEL** held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham at 7.00 pm on **Thursday 14 February 2013**

PRESENT: Mr M E Baines (Chairman, in the Chair)
Mr J T Dale
Mr D C Hollis
Mr J M Lammie
Mr M A Oxley
Mr C A Parsons (substitute for Mr W J Cross)
Mrs C Vernon

OFFICERS PRESENT: Mrs V Brambini Operational Director for Places
Miss L Tyers Democratic Services

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr T C King Portfolio Holder for Finance and Places Asset Management
Mr M D A Pocock Portfolio Holder for Resources and Places Operations

NON-PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: Miss G Waller

APOLOGIES: Mrs C Cartwright, Mr W J Cross and Mr B A Montgomery

710 RECORD OF MEETINGS

The Record of the Meeting of the Places Scrutiny Panel held on 15 November 2012, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

The Record of the Special Meeting of the Places Scrutiny Panel on 17 January 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

711 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Oxley declared a pecuniary interest if fees and charges were discussed as his mother was a service user.

712 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

No petitions, deputations or questions had been received from members of the public.

713 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS

No questions with notice had been received from members.

714 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS

No Notices of Motion had been received from members.

715 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE PANEL FOR A DECISION IN RELATION TO CALL IN OF A DECISION

No matter had been referred to the Panel for a decision in relation to call-in of a decision in accordance with Procedure Rule 206.

SCRUTINY

716 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Places Asset Management ,Mr King, gave a verbal update on the Community Infrastructure Levy.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- The CIL would replace most of the S106 funding and would be charged on all residential developments and some other type of developments.
- 85-100 m² would be the equivalent of £10,000 which was similar to S106. The Cabinet was looking at CIL and Affordable Housing contributions equating to £23,600 a property.
- Credit for small developers to enable development was being considered. This would give an incentive to build and help local jobs and businesses.
- The option to defer payment for single, family use developments was also being examined. Officers were looking at whether a charge could be placed on a property which would be reviewed after a number of years and possibly withdrawn. If a property was sold the value of the charge would come back to the Council.
- Government guidelines stated that 15% of CIL would go to areas without a neighbourhood plan; with areas where there was a neighbourhood plan in place receiving 25%.
- The Council had engaged with parishes, of which seven had responded, about what they wanted for their areas. It was assumed that parishes would want to take the money and there was currently no guidance about what would happen if it was not taken up. Money could be pooled together but it had to be seen to be delivering for a particular area.
- The Council was already meeting with agents and developers around CIL. If a developer was to state that CIL would make a particular development unaffordable a viability assessment would be required.
- CIL would generate a sizeable amount of money for the Council to invest in community infrastructure, including around £6m for county wide infrastructure. There was an assumption that not everything would be paid for through CIL as the Council had £21m worth of projects planned of which around £7m would be

funded by CIL.

717 RUTLAND WATER PARTNERSHIP UPDATE

Report No. 41/2013 from the Operational Director for Places was received. The Operational Director for Places, Mrs Brambini, introduced the report, the Purpose of which was to provide an update on progress with the activities of the Rutland Water Partnership.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- Members were pleased that the Action Plan was still ongoing but accepted it needed to be reviewed.
- References were made in the Action Plan to officers who were no longer employed by the Council. The Action Plan had been taken directly off the website and had not been updated.
- The circuit around Rutland Water was not complete but Lyndon Top was the only sector deemed to be dangerous which is why the land had been acquired. Other sections, where the road was used, were not deemed to be dangerous.
- As the Action Plan was up to 2012 many people had assumed that it had now finished. The Action Plan required updating and the role of the partnership considered.
- Anglian Water was considered to be a very important partner.

AGREED:

- 1) That the contents of Report No. 41/2013 be **NOTED**.

718 SITE ALLOCATIONS

The Operational Director for Places circulated a briefing paper on the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, introduced the briefing paper.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- Sites for housing and employment which had previously been proposed in Uppingham had now been excluded to allow the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan to identify and allocate suitable sites. Agreement had been reached that proposals for Uppingham would be ready by 30 April 2013.
- If the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan was not supported through the referendum, the Council may have to make recommendations. It was vital to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan could be delivered.
- If the Neighbourhood Plan was voted down, the understanding was that it could go back with a modified proposal. It needed to be made clear what the alternative was if it was rejected.
- If Branston Road, Uppingham was left out of the DPD and an application for development was submitted, there is a high likelihood that it would be approved as it was a brownfield site.

719 Q3 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT 2012/13

Report 23/2013 from the Chief Executive was received. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, introduced the report, the purpose of which was to show the Council's performance, for the third quarter ending of 2012/13 and the year to date. It was noted that it covered performance against the Council's strategic aims and objectives, the Customer Services team and sickness absence targets.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- Concern was expressed at the number of planning applications going to appeal due to non-determination by the Council. The Quarter 1 figures were dragging down the average for the year but a new manager had started in May 2012 and the team was being much stricter on timescales and refusals.
- Flexibility on councillors being able to refer items to Committee was still needed and was a balancing act. In some cases applicants and developers saw the Committee as an easier option to getting applications approved rather than through officers and that perception needed to change. Often some contentious applications needed to be heard in public for transparency.
- Seasonal fluctuations for waste collection needed to be considered and perhaps schedules reconsidered, especially during the winter, as some villages had not received a green waste collection following Christmas for the last few years.
- From April 2013, none of Rutland's waste would go directly to landfill as it would be transferred to an Energy from Waste facility in Nottingham. This was excellent news and a real success for Rutland.
- It was pleasing to note that sickness was lower than the national average. Sickness within the Places directorate gave no cause for concern.

AGREED:

- 1) That the overall position in relation to performance for the year 2012/13 be **NOTED.**

720 Q3 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT 2012/13

Report 22/2013 from the Strategic Director of Resources was received. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Asset Management, Mr King, introduced the report, the purpose of which was to inform Cabinet on how the Council was performing against its revenue and capital budgets and report the forecast year end outturn position as at the 31 December 2012.

The following points were noted during discussion:

- With regard to winter maintenance there was still some salt left but not as much as anticipated. All villages were topped up regularly and parishes received three refills and were then billed for any subsequent refills.
- Next time the gritting process was reviewed a request was made that schools and their access should be considered. There needed to be a balance between gritting schools and then staff being able to turn up for work, as many lived some distance from their schools.

- The task and finish group looking at street lighting was still meeting and E-on were undertaking a full audit of street lights.

AGREED:

- 1) That the contents of Report No. 22/2013 be **NOTED**.

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS AND TOPICS

721 WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13 AND REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN

It was proposed to consider an item on the Transfer of Assets under the Academy System at the Special Meeting on the 14 March 2013.

Assets of Community Value was highlighted as going to Cabinet on 5 March 2013. Mr King gave some background to the decision. The key points of which were:

- Community groups would be able to identify assets which they believed were of value to the community.
- Once an asset had been nominated and accepted by the Authority it would be put on an Asset List and if the owner wished to sell then that process had to be put on hold for six months to give the group that nominated the asset the opportunity to bid to buy it.
- The asset had to meet a number of criteria to be included on the Asset List and it would be for the nominating group to demonstrate that it added to the social and community well being of an area. If it was not accepted onto the List then there would be no appeal, but if it was accepted then the owner could appeal and also claim compensation if there was a delay in any sale. An asset would sit on the register for five years.

722 REVIEW OF RISK REGISTER

Officers would ensure that hard copies of the risk register were brought to future meetings.

723 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

No other urgent business had been previously notified to the person presiding.

724 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 14 March 2013 at 7.00pm. (Special)

---oOo---

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.55pm.

---oOo---

