



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 28 November 2013**

PRESENT: Mr J T Dale (Chairman, in the Chair)
Mr M E Baines
Mr W J Cross
Mr D C Hollis
Mr J Lammie
Mr J R Munton
Mr M A Oxley
Mr D L Richardson
Mrs C L Vernon

OFFICERS	Mrs V Brambini	Director for Places (Development and Economy)
PRESENT:	Mr D Brown	Director for Places (Environment, Transport and Planning)
	Mr R Clayton	Culture & Leisure Services Manager
	Mr B Culpin	Senior Planning Officer
	Miss M Gamston	Democratic Services Officer

IN ATTENDANCE:	Mr T C King	Portfolio Holder for Finance, Property, Development Control, Planning Policy, Economic Development and Tourism
	Mr M D A Pocock	Portfolio Holder for Highways, Waste and Recycling, Transport and Parking, Revenues and Benefits, Democratic Services
	Miss G Waller	

APOLOGIES: Mrs C J Cartwright and Mr Montgomery

559 RECORD OF MEETINGS

The Record of the Meeting of the Places Scrutiny Panel held on 15 August 2013, 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 held on 5 September 2013, 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 held on 3 October 2013, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed and signed by the

Chairman.

560 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

For the record:

In respect of item 8, Revised Draft Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan:-

- Mr Baines stated that if the Plan or the retail plan was discussed in detail he would take no part.
- Mr Lammie stated that he was a resident of the town.
- Mr Oxley stated that he was a resident of the town.

In respect of item 11, Sports and Leisure Community Facilities:-

- Mr Lammie stated that he was involved with Uppingham Cricket Club.
- Mr Munton stated that he was involved with Royce Rangers.

561 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

No petitions, deputations or questions had been received.

562 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS

Mr Oxley asked the following question:

“Can the Chairman of this Panel please advise when we will be considering a report on Flood Defence as councils are legally required, annually, to consider flood defence?”

The Chairman, Mr Dale, invited Mr Baines to respond.

Mr Baines replied that this was legally required, the timing of which was to be advised by officers. There was no main river flooding in Rutland.

Mr Oxley then asked that this could be an agenda item. This was agreed.

563 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS

No Notices of Motion had been received from members.

564 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

565 TRANSPORT TASK AND FINISH GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

Report No. 257/2013 from the Director for Places (Environment, Planning and Transport) was received.

The purpose of which was to provide officer response to the proposals contained in the report of the Transport Task and Finish Group which was submitted to the joint People (Children) and Places Scrutiny Panel on the 21st March 2013.

The Chairman, Mr Dale, invited Mr Baines to introduce the report and raise the collective questions and comments of the Task and Finish Group.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- i) The response to the original consultation was limited, containing no details of the parishes which responded. The Task and Finish Group would have liked more detail;
- ii) Group recommendation A2 – the present offer related to the nearest college. Recommendation for the extension of this service to be considered in view of academy operations;
- iii) Group recommendation A3 – It was accepted that an Uppingham Hopper service would be increased expenditure and this could not be linked to a particular saving proposal;
- iv) Group recommendation B1 – The Group had provided mapping therefore queried the workload and financial analysis referred to under financial implications;
- v) Group recommendation B2 – at least one simple solution had been put forward. The Group believed that the RF1 implementation had been over complicated;
- vi) Group recommendation B3 – the timing and cost could be improved;
- vii) Group recommendation B4 – The Group believed that it was up to the schools to adapt to the bus services available and that a spike in workload was an unacceptable reason for not doing anything;
- viii) Group recommendation B5 – evidence and logic on cost of savings relating to the adoption of the statutory minimum service for concessionary passes was requested;
- ix) Group recommendation B6 – vague on progress. Stated that “opportunities will be taken by Officers to encourage this to happen”;
- x) Group recommendation B7 – some progress had been made with regard to providing large print bus timetables. However, the Group felt that the cost appeared to be excessive and requested a breakdown of the figure. The Group also queried why the provision of the timetables was by the Council rather than the bus company;
- xi) Group recommendation B8 – the Group found the response very vague and believed that it did not take into account government policy. The Group queried whether there had been any contact with social services;
- xii) Group recommendation B9 – the Group found the response to be very vague;
- xiii) Group recommendation B10 – Whissendine Parish Council had not been approached;
- xiv) Group recommendation C1 – the Group requested details of charges and parental contribution;
- xv) Group recommendation C3 – the Group believed an audit of bus passes was required; that there was no evidence of passes being checked and that the response suggested the Council was pro-active than was the case;

- xvi) Group recommendation C5 – that the Adult Social Care and SEN transport budgets were still shown under two budget codes. The Group had requested this to be one budget;
- xvii) Group recommendation A1 – Denominational Transport. The original findings had supported subsidised public transport and extra public transport provision: this did not appear to have been addressed. Members were advised that home to school transport had been rationalised resulting in savings of £57,000. Post 16 transport only had three contracted routes with students mostly using public services ;
- xviii) That the consultation undertaken on post 16 transport did not correspond to the Task and Finish Group’s suggestions;
- xix) The Group felt that generically the officer response to the proposals of the Transport Task and Finish Group lacked detail;
- xx) That some of the recommendations made in the original paper had not been clear enough to interpret.
- xxi) That members of the Task and Finish Group, Officers and the Portfolio Holder, if available, would meet to discuss the recommendations. A further report would be brought to this Panel.

AGREED:

- i) That members of the Task and Finish Group would meet with Officers and the Portfolio Holder, if available, to further discuss the recommendations made by the Group. A further report will be brought to this Panel.

566 REVISED DRAFT UPPINGHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Report No. 250/2013 from the Director for Places (Development and Economy) was received.

The Senior Planning Officer, Mr Culpin, introduced the report the purpose of which was to consider the Revised Draft Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan consultation document.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That the first draft of the Plan was published in May 2013 with a six week consultation during June and July. Issues were raised resulting in a revised draft of the Plan being published;
- ii) The Council was entitled to respond as part of the consultation on the revised draft of the Plan;
- iii) The revised draft of the Plan set out more clearly defined policies/proposals including:
 - a) Guidance on the scale of additional housing planned for in the plan. The three allocated sites each had a policy which covered the expected development density on a clearly defined area referenced on the supporting maps;
 - b) Additional ‘self-build’ housing developments of up to six dwellings;
 - c) Proposal that additional land be allocated for employment purposes on

- d) Inclusion of land at the southern end of Tod's Piece as an Important Open Space and exclusion of the previously designated IOS on land to the rear of the garages on the Branston Road redevelopment site;
- e) Review the Plan every three to five years in accordance with RCC policies;
- iv) The revised Plan proposed that 2 of the 3 allocated residential sites should be built out at a density of 25 dwellings per hectare (Site B – north side of Leicester Road and Site C – south side of Leicester Road) with the smaller site (Site A – north side of Leicester Road) to be built out at 30 dwellings per hectare;
- v) The revised Plan proposed a small extension to prime shopping frontage. This would be within the province of Localism and neighbourhood planning;
- vi) Following consultation on the revised plan Uppingham Town Council would prepare a schedule to submit to the County Council by the end of December for the Council to ensure that it is in accordance with the Core Strategy and policy framework. It was proposed to take a report to Cabinet on 21 January 2014. The revised Plan would then go back to consultation then to referendum and for adoption;
- vii) That it had been requested that the Plan included a warning of possible changes to the plan to recognise that the Plan will need to be reviewed;
- viii) That the ethos of lower density sites was to try to get clusters of houses with a more generous distribution of open land;
- ix) That this was the first opportunity that some Ward Members had been given to comment on the emerging plan;
- x) That it would be useful for all Ward Members to be involved in future neighbourhood plans within their Wards;
- xi) Proposal 10 – Transport – Car Parking Policy – “The Plan supports a move to local control or ownership of the town's main car parks” Members were advised that Uppingham Town Council was discussing a Service Level Agreement with a fixed fee to be paid to the County Council;
- xii) That at this stage there was not a lot of support for a new road linking the Station Road Industrial Estate to the Seaton Road from businesses on the Estate;
- xiii) That the map showing Important Open Spaces (IOS) on agenda page 50 did not include recreation land such as playing fields at the Community College and Uppingham School. Its purpose is to designate valued open spaces that should be protected from infill development . Members were advised that these IOS were within the planned limits to development (within the black

- xiv) That Primary Shopping Frontages were street frontages where there was a need to protect and retain the viability of shops by restricting the ability of shops to change use to non-retail use;;
- xv) That Secondary Shopping Frontage was more relaxed than Primary. Non A uses were less restricted by policy with more freedom for example to become a restaurant or take-away;
- xvi) The plan noted that approximately 35% of new homes to be built in Uppingham by 2026 would be 'affordable' homes. It was suggested that , with lower density builds officers would have to look at the capacity for Affordable Housing in accordance with RCC targets.
- xvii) Concern was expressed over the safeguarding of a by-pass to the west of the town. This had appeared in the first draft of the Plan however the County Council raised concerns that there were no funds in place and no firm proposals. Uppingham Town Council made the decision not to safeguard;
- xviii) The Neighbourhood Plan Task Group and the RCC Liaison Officer, Mr Culpin, were congratulated on the professional way that the Plan had been put together.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the content of the Revised Draft Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan, Appendix A to Report No. 250/2013

---oOo---

8.00 pm Mr Cross left the meeting and did not return.

---oOo---

567 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT – QUARTER 2 2013/2014

Report No. 236/2013 from the Chief Executive was received.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That processing of planning applications should improve following the implementation of the new software and the issues related to the implementation having been resolved.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the contents of Report No. 236/2013.

568 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT 2013/14 QUARTER 2

Report No. 241/2013 from the Director for Resources was received.

Members held no discussion on this item.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the contents of Report No. 241/2013.

569 SPORTS AND LEISURE COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Report No. 266/2013 from the Director for Places (Development and Economy) was received.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Property, Development Control, Planning Policy, Economic Development and Tourism, Mr King, introduced the report the purpose of which was to outline how the Council will support the needs of the County's active and growing population through strategic investment in sports and leisure community facilities over the next 10 years, using a variety of funding sources.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That this was an external report produced to provide a steer on priorities;
- ii) That endeavours had been made to engage with clubs and non-members;
- iii) That on page 59 of the agenda the Total (PxF) for New multi-use facility should read 9;
- iv) That discussions had taken place between the Portfolio Holder and officers regarding the scoring process; with further work on the process being required;
- v) Concern was expressed that with regards to sport the report identified the problem but did not offer a solution;
- vi) That the first two reports were before the swimming pool failure;
- vii) That comments expressed by clubs were not necessarily the views of all club members;
- viii) That the aim of the report was to get into the detail of the facilities available and where placed within the county. That more local knowledge was required to gain an understanding of how communities work;
- ix) That the report was structured as a framework to assess needs and prioritise funding throughout the county; showing how funding would be used;
- x) That Table 6 (agenda page 87) listed the priority and feasibility criteria. This criteria would be applied to other priorities as they arose. The levels of criteria had been suggested around health benefits but could be modified if there was general support;
- xi) This was an externally produced report. A specific project could be scored differently with additional knowledge;
- xii) That the position with Royce Rangers (Appendix 3 to Report No. 266/2013, paragraph 4.19) had changed since the report was written;
- xiii) That for clubs to combine when identifying needs and priorities could result in

- xiv) That the list of activities in indoor spaces (Appendix C of Appendix 2 to Report No. 266/2013) would be forwarded to parish councillors for comment;
- xv) That other sports, such as hunting, beagling and shooting needed to be engaged with;
- xvi) That Oakham School used the Catmose Sports Centre when their own sports hall was not sufficient to meet the demands of the school. This was managed by Stevenage Leisure Limited;
- xvii) That the report made very little mention of sports that older people were engaged in;
- xviii) That the lack of detail in the report meant that Members were unable to give a strategic steer;
- xix) That the report did not reflect the data requested in the consultation;
- xx) That Rutland was one of the best provided for counties in the country for sports facilities;
- xxi) That the Council had a good working relationship with Uppingham and Oakham public schools;
- xxii) Members were requested to feedback to the Culture & Leisure Services Manager, Mr Clayton, any inaccuracies within the reports.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the Sports & Leisure Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Appendix 1 to Report No. 266/2013

570 STREET LIGHTING TASK AND FINISH GROUP

Report No. 267/2013 from Councillor Lammie was received.

Mr Lammie introduced the report the purpose of which was to report to the Places Scrutiny Panel the work of the Street Lighting Task and Finish Group and to seek the Panel's approval for the Group's recommendations.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That the report set out specific recommendations and six key principles behind any new policy;
- ii) That Appendix 2 to Report No. 267/2013 showed the anomalies;
- iii) That recommendations 2.2 and 2.4 related to work to be requested of officers and reported back to the Scrutiny Panel;
- iv) That recommendation 2.3 was to ensure a line of communication;
- v) That the Local Authority, Town Council and Parish Councils were all lighting authorities;
- vi) That the policy would be consulted on with the Parish and Town Councils;
- vii) That consideration needed to be given to the cost liability of turning lights off;
- viii) That the Task and Finish Group had found that lighting in Rutland had been installed on an ad-hoc basis; no one clear view of had responsibility for what. Other authorities had policies in place. Rutland also had issues where Rutland District Council became Parish and Town Councils. Following the administrative transfer from Leicestershire back to Rutland a lot of the historical information no longer existed;

- ix) That paragraph 6.3 of Report No. 267/2013 did not include Parish Meeting, some of which did collect a precept;
- x) That there were 70 lights in Parish Meeting areas;
- xi) That future charges needed to be equitable;
- xii) Clarification was sought regarding paragraph 2 of Appendix 6 to Report No. 267/2013: "RCC will broadly have responsibility for Highways lighting and Towns/Parishes for footpaths and pavements". Members were informed that it was envisaged that this would be considered in greater detail by officers. That in terms of highway and footway lighting there were British Standards for both;
- xiii) That in some Wards there was uncertainty over whether to invest and reduce the lighting bill;
- xiv) That LED lighting was one fifth of the cost of traditional lighting with lower maintenance costs;
- xv) That lighting would require standardisation across the county to be able to take LED;
- xvi) That there was no statutory requirement for the Local Authority to provide lighting;
- xvii) That some Parishes may want to remove lighting to reduce light pollution;
- xviii) That if a policy was to be implemented for 2015-2016 Parishes needed to be made aware if there would be any large increases in precepts. Parishes need to be encouraged to look ahead when setting their precepts;
- xix) That the provision of lighting in Oakham needed to be considered as a separate issue;
- xx) Neil Tomlinson, Contracts & Maintenance Engineer, was thanked for his support.

The Chair, Mr Dale, thanked the Task and Finish Group for their hard work.

AGREED:

- i) That Panel supported the outline principles set out in section 6 to Report No. 267/2013 and that they should be the basis of any policy going forward.
- ii) That officers would evaluate the feasibility, costs and legal implications of the three sets of proposals as set out in Appendices 4.5.6 to Report No. 267/2013 and from this produce a report to the Scrutiny Panel with recommendations for a new Council policy.
- iii) That the Scrutiny Panel delegated to Councillor Lammie, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, as the contact for officers if further information is required regarding Report No. 267/2013.

571 TRAVEL4RUTLAND CYCLE ROUTE INFRASTRUCTURE

Report No. 258/2013 from the Director for Places (Environment, Planning and Transport) was received.

The Director for Places (Environment, Planning and Transport), Mr Brown, introduced the report the purpose of which was to present the cycle route infrastructure proposed

for the implementation with the Travel4Rutland Local Sustainable Transport Fund grant from the Department for Transport.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i) That the Travel4Rutland project consisted of four work streams: Oakham bus station, Tourism bus (ShoreLink), workplace shuttle buses (WorkLink) and cycling improvements;
- ii) That Cabinet had considered potential schemes;
- iii) That £480k was allocated for the 2013/2014 financial year from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) to specific schemes and £200k was allocated for 2014/2015;
- iv) That all parishes had been consulted with the following schemes being put forward:
 - a. Barrow/Cottesmore – link with Market Overton and Cottesmore - £250k
 - b. Essendine/Ryhall – cycleway on A6121 – c£130k
 - c. Cottesmore/Exton (as far as the coach road) – £150k
 - d. Glaston/Morcott - £240k
 - e. Uppingham – circular route along the Leicester Road, the A47 and A6003 - £400k
 - f. Thistleton Lane, Greetham to crash gates (Kendrew Barracks) - £140k
- v) That there was a consensus of opinion in Uppingham that supported the view that Uppingham should have a cycle route connecting it to Oakham. It was acknowledged that the topography was challenging however more emphasis needed to be placed on being able to cycle safely between the towns. People regularly walked from Preston to Uppingham along the A6003;
- vi) That there was a gap in the footpath along the A47 Uppingham bypass where it was not joined up to the A6003;
- vii) Mr Oxley requested that the Panel request that Uppingham to Preston be connected by a cycle track; that the signed cycle route from Oakham to Preston via Brooke and Ridlington be extended to allow Uppingham to connect to Oakham as part of the Heritage Cycle Route;
- viii) That all schemes would need to be scored prior to being recommended;
- ix) The number of cycles carried was requested and a report on the link of cycle routes with ShoreLink;
- x) That it takes six years for a bus route to become established; that the ShoreLink service would be adjusted as information was gathered on usage;
- xi) That the Authority was complying with Prince2 management principles (Projects IN Controlled Environments);
- xii) That there had been two phases for submitting a bid to the Department for Transport. The bid was not approved until phase two, however the Department for Transport insisted on the same timeline as Phase 1;
- xiii) That consideration should be given to the safety of cycle routes in the south of the county including upgrading the existing route to Uppingham and the Heritage Cycle Route between Caldecott and Stoke Dry;
- xiv) That other consultation was required to allow some villages, that had lobbied strongly for a cycle route, the opportunity to be heard;
- xv) That factors had been raised where villages had no or inadequate links to

- xvi) The Panel requested that a report be brought to Scrutiny including more data to allow Members to make an informed decision and look extra routes added by members of the Panel; to include costing for future maintenance.

AGREED:

- i) That a further report would be brought to Panel.

---oOo---

9.53 pm Mr Hollis left the meeting and did not return.

---oOo---

---oOo---

At 9.55 pm and in accordance with the provisions of Procedure Rule 58, Close of Meetings, it was

AGREED

That the meeting be extended to 10.15 pm to allow the remaining items of business to be concluded.

---oOo---

572 STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER

Report No. 260/2013 from the Director of Resources was received.

Members were advised that Risk Ref. 12 Catmose Campus had been reviewed by the Director for Places (Development and Economy) and should be shown as Amber in Appendix A to Report No. 260/2013. It was shown correctly in the risk matrix (Appendix B to Report No. 260/2013).

AGREED:

- i) That Panel noted the contents of the risk register and the actions underway to address the risks.

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS AND TOPICS

573 WORKING PROGRAMME 2012/13 AND REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN

The Panel was asked to consider the Forward Plan and Work Programme 2012/13.

It was noted that Travel4Rutland Cycle Route Infrastructure will be removed from the Cabinet agenda for 7 January 2014.

574 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

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

575 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 16 January 2014

Thursday 13 March 2014

---oOo---

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.56 pm.

---oOo---