



# Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.

Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307 DX28340 Oakham

## **RECORD OF DECISION AT A MEETING OF THE CABINET**

**Tuesday, 10th October, 2017 at 9.30 am**

---oOo---

**Decisions published on 12 October 2017**

**Decisions will be implemented on 20 October 2017 unless the Call-in Procedure as outlined in Procedure Rule 206 is invoked.**

---oOo---

**PRESENT:** Mr T Mathias  
Mr R Foster  
Mr O Hemsley  
Mr D Wilby  
Mr A Walters

**APOLOGIES:** Mr R Clifton

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Mrs H Briggs Chief Executive  
Mr S Della Rocca Assistant Director - Finance  
Dr T O'Neill Director for People and Deputy Chief Executive  
Mr D Brown Director for Places  
Mrs D Mogg Director for Resources  
Mr M Andrews Deputy Director for People  
Mrs A Wylie Head of Legal and Corporate Governance  
Mr N Tomlinson Senior Highways Manager

Miss S Bingham

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Mr O Bird Ward Member Oakham South West  
Mr J Dale Ward Member Oakham North East  
Mr G Brown Ward Member Ketton

### **337 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN AND/OR HEAD OF THE PAID SERVICE**

There were no announcements from the Chairman or Head of the Paid Service.

### **338 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

### **339 RECORD OF DECISIONS**

Mr Walters requested that item 276, point i) was removed from the minutes as it was not agreed by Cabinet that all facilities management to be one package of works.

The Record of Decisions made by Cabinet on 19 September 2017, with the amendment noted above, was confirmed by Cabinet.

### **340 ITEMS RAISED BY SCRUTINY**

The Chairman had not been formally notified of any items raised by Scrutiny.

### **341 OAKHAM TOWN CENTRE**

#### **(KEY DECISION)**

Report No. 142/2017 from the Director for Places (Environment, Planning and Transport).

The Chief Executive, Mrs Briggs, provided a presentation to Cabinet. Details of which are available at:

<http://rutlandcounty.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=133&MId=1747>

Mr Mathias Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Places (Highways, Transport and Market Towns) invited Mr Bird, Ward Member for Oakham South West and Mr Dale, Ward Member for Oakham North East to speak:

Mr Bird raised the following points:

- Comments received from the general public included:
  - 'Brilliant Idea, why had this not been done years ago'
  - 'The Town Centre is dead, why bother'
- Mr Bird offered his full support to the recommendations.
- Good design was vital and needed to reflect the aspirations of the community and the heritage of the County.
- The proposal was for traffic flow to be west to east; this was partly due to the future increased closure time of the level crossing (closed for 30 minutes in every hour). Mr Bird raised concerns that this could create an empty vacuum with no vehicles on the High Street.
- It was vital that the community had the opportunity to input into the final design; there had been excellent and creative ideas that could potentially be incorporated.

Mr Dale raised the following points:

- There had been very little change to the High Street in the past 50 years.
- Rutland County Council (RCC) owed it to the shop owners and landlords to improve the High Street.
- Mr Dale was in full support of the recommendation and scheme. This would make improvements for the next generation.
- Mr Dale raised concerns regarding the use of cobble stones, with his preferred option to keep lines and paving clear.
- The scheme must be delivered on or below budget.
- All future consultation would include groups that represent people with disabilities.

The Chief Executive, Mrs Briggs, confirmed that in other areas of the country, where similar schemes had been delivered an increase in economic prosperity had been seen.

Mr Mathias Leader and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Places (Highways, Transport and Market Towns) thanked Mr Bird and Mr Dale for their comments as Ward Members for Oakham.

During discussion the following points were raised:

- i. Further work was required on traffic and parking as part of the detailed design.
- ii. Project management would be vital to the success of the scheme and to ensure that work was not duplicated, for example, roads being excavated more than once for utilities to be accessed.
- iii. The council had a number of major projects/schemes currently in progress; therefore, staying on budget was key.
- iv. There was potential to work with landlords and shop owners to improve the fascias of properties on the High Street.
- v. Mr Tomlinson - Senior Highways Manager confirmed the following points regarding Target Costing:
  - RCC were already working with a contractor (Eurovia), selected under the Midland Highways Alliance's (MHA) Medium Schemes Framework 2 contract (MSF2), on the initial plan & design. A target cost will be built up from an agreed programme, using equipment, labour and materials costs, including an agreed element of contractor profit. This is called Open Book Target Costing and allows for more accurate costing throughout the scheme.
  - Risk would not be included as part of the agreed target cost, however, a priced Risk Register would be created for the scheme, and would be included in the budget.
  - A 'Pain Gain' mechanism would be used for any cost variations. This is a type of pricing mechanism that allows the employer and the contractor an approach for sharing risk and opportunity. If the scheme was to be completed at less than the agreed target cost, the saving amount would be shared by RCC and the contractor. If the scheme was over spent, the amount would be covered by the contractor and RCC. The split of gain (under target cost) and pain (over target costs) is calculated by a specific formula at contract award. Target Costing was a transparent and open way of operating.
- vi. Mr Brown – Director for Places confirmed the following points regarding traffic flow:
  - A West to East flow would avoid traffic diverting along Station Road.
  - The High Street/Mill Street roundabout was still at the design phase; however there were more options with the traffic flow West to East.
  - Traffic surveys had taken place in April 2017 and July 2017. An additional opportunity had arisen for a survey to take place to cover both out of school holiday times and a one way system being in-place. This additional survey confirmed that the predicted figures for traffic flow were correct.
  - The effect on traffic flow at Brook Road Level Crossing would be minimal with a prediction of approximately 30 additional vehicles per hour.

- vii. The petition submitted during the consultation process was biased as there was no opportunity for signatories to express favour for a one way system.
- viii. The number of responses to the consultation was low; however Members agreed that this could reflect public support, as there were few negative comments.
- ix. It was confirmed that the consultation was publicised fully.
- x. Mr Mathias confirmed that Rutland Access Group would be on the list of consultees for the next stage of the consultation process.

## **DECISION**

1. Cabinet **APPROVED** the vision for Oakham Town Centre as the unique, attractive and vibrant heart of the county.
2. Cabinet **APPROVED** the selection of Option A (one-way), as the preferred design to be taken forward for detailed design.

### Reasons for Recommendation

1. *Option A (one-way) provides the greatest opportunity to deliver the vision for the town centre by improving the pedestrian environment while balancing the desire to maintain the number of parking spaces on the High Street. This option will also improve the environment and reduce the dominance of vehicles by removing a significant amount of traffic.*
2. *Option A was the most popular option from the consultation exercise. However, it is acknowledged that a significant number of signatories signed a petition against this proposal. The weight given to the petition must take account of the limitations set out in section 5.8. Considering all responses, including the Neighbourhood Plan consultation, on balance Option A is considered to be the most popular option.*
3. *It is recognised that the consultation exercise identified concerns about:*
  - *the impact of the redistributed traffic on adjacent roads; and*
  - *a reduction on passing trade as a result of lower traffic flow.*
4. *To deliver the vision for the town centre the traffic on the High Street will need to be reduced. This will cause an increase in traffic on adjacent roads. The traffic analysis shows that these roads have the capacity to accommodate the increased flows with mitigation measures that will form part of the detailed design.*
5. *It is not possible to model the impact of reducing the volume of traffic on trade. However, evidence shows that well planned public realm improvement schemes can significantly boost footfall and trade (see 16.4 The Pedestrian Pound – the business case for better streets and places). This report states “there is consistent evidence that customers like pedestrian environments and dislike traffic. Retailers have been shown to over-estimate the importance of the car for customer travel.”*
6. *It is recommended that Option A is taken forward to the detailed design stage for the following reasons:*
  - *It is the option which most closely aligns with the vision and objectives set out in section 2;*

- *It was the favoured option from the consultation exercise, and*
- *The areas of concern raised during the consultation exercise can be addressed through the detailed design.*

### **342 ANY ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

No items of urgent business had previously been notified to the Chairman.

---oOo---

**The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 10.38 am.**

---oOo---