



# Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.

Telephone 01572 722577 Email [governance@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:governance@rutland.gov.uk)

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

**Tuesday, 18th December, 2018 at 10.00 am**

**Decisions Published on Thursday 20 December 2018**

**Decisions will be implemented on Wednesday 2 January 2019 unless the Call-in Procedure as outlined in Procedure Rule 206 is invoked.**

**PRESENT:** Mr O Hemsley  
Mr G Brown  
Mr R Foster  
Mr A Walters  
Mr D Wilby  
Mrs L Stephenson

<b>OFFICERS</b>	Mrs H Briggs	Chief Executive
<b>PRESENT:</b>	Mr S Della Rocca	Strategic Director for Resources
	Mr P Horsfield	Deputy Director Corporate Governance
	Mr S Ingram	Strategic Director for Places
	Mr M Andrews	Director for People (DAS)
	Mrs H Bremner	Head of Communications
	Mrs J Morley	Governance Officer

<b>ALSO</b>	Mr S Pearce	Associate Director, RegenCo
<b>PRESENT:</b>	Mr J Reilly	Principal Estates Surveyor, DIO/MoD
	Ms R Sanders	Director of Urban Design, FABRIK
	Mr R Stone	Head of Estates, DIO/MoD
	Ms G Waller	Councillor

### **479 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received.

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

The Chairman reminded members of the public that they were permitted to film, blog, tweet or take photographs of the meeting but if they did, to do so without causing a disturbance to the meeting proceedings. The Chairman also pointed out that members

of the public who were not part of the meeting had not consented to being recorded and therefore should not be included in any recording activity.

---o0o---

The Chairman led a one minute's silence in remembrance of former Councillor and Leader, Terry King.

---o0o---

#### **481 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Mr G Brown declared an interest in item 7, the Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan Submission, as he had led the neighbourhood planning group responsible for the report. Mr Brown would withdraw from the meeting during discussion on this item.

#### **482 RECORD OF DECISIONS**

The Record of Decisions made at the meeting of the Cabinet held on 20 November 2018, copies of which had been previously circulated, was confirmed.

#### **483 ITEMS RAISED BY SCRUTINY**

Mr B Callaghan, Chairman of the Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel had submitted an item to the Leader on behalf of the panel. The submission was as follows;

*In your discussions in regard to the St George's Barracks Masterplan, please can I ask that you take account of the following concerns raised at the special Growth, Infrastructure and Resources scrutiny meeting on 11 October.*

- 1. There was concern in regard to inadequate communication, leading to some parishes allegedly being unaware of the project. Therefore please could a communication plan be included in any project plans, to allay any such concerns.*
- 2. There was concern as to how the project would be affected should the HIF (Higher Infrastructure Funding) bid not be successful. Therefore please could there be some narrative in regard to this scenario.*

Mrs H Briggs' response included the following points:

- There had been a strategy plan for communications right from the start of the project. All parishes had been invited to public meetings and the St Georges Advisory Group included members from the affected parishes.
- An e-newsletter giving information on the St George's Barracks project went out to a significant number of Rutland residents
- If the HIF bid was unsuccessful the MoD would need to revisit the proposal. The HIF process did allow for a lesser amount of HIF as well as none at all.

## 484 ST GEORGE'S BARRACKS EVOLVING MASTER PLAN AND DRAFT HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND BUSINESS CASE

Report No. 234/201 was received from the Chief Executive.

Mr Oliver Hemsley, Leader of the Council, introduced the report, the purpose of which was for Cabinet to review the evolving Master Plan for the St George's Site and the associated HIF Business Case and assess whether it should be recommended to Council for approval.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- Rutland was growing and needed to continue to grow and prosper.
- Comprehensive consultation had taken place to make sure that the plan was sound and that it would retain the unique nature of our villages
- In order to avoid retrofitting infrastructure, investment in infrastructure would be made right from the beginning.
- The bid would enable £95 million of funding for infrastructure the benefits of which would be seen right across the County.
- The bid submission did not commit the Council to anything further.
- In a response to comments submitted in writing by Ms G Waller, Ward Member for Normanton which included the villages of Edith Weston and North Luffenham, Mr R Stone, Head of Estates at the MoD confirmed that although compulsory purchases could sometimes take longer than a year, 2.5 years had been allowed within the timeline and therefore delivery of the project would not be affected.
- The level of financial detail would increase and improve as the project moved forward. An experienced development company would be brought onboard which would be able to supply more details on the design works and the viability assessment needed for a planning application.
- The project's inclusion in the Local Plan in the early part of 2019 would require a level of information in order to produce a detailed viability study.
- The MoD would be happy to share with Cabinet information that they had had to date although some would be exempt to the public as it was commercially sensitive. Mrs H Briggs would liaise with the MoD regarding the provision of these papers.
- The Head of Estates at the MoD reassured Councillors that they were already working closely with the design team to ensure that the project would deliver something much more akin to the layout of a Rutland village rather than another generic housing estate, especially as that was what would generate the value from the site.
- If successful in its bid, funding from the Garden Communities Fund would allow the Council to set the standards for the development very early on in the process. As part of its submission, the Council requested funding to design an exemplar community in terms of health benefits and encouraging community engagement and had support from Lord Matthew Taylor, a housing policy expert on the design of garden villages.
- An extra Council meeting would be scheduled in addition to Annual Council in May to hear the Regulation 19 Report. New members would be fully briefed on the matter.
- The Masterplan included provision for a Health and Wellbeing Centre and consultation with GPs and the CCGs had already taken place. The HIF business

case and the Garden Communities bid included letters of support from the CCGs which acknowledged the existing pressures in primary care in Rutland.

- Health and wellbeing would be designed into the scheme as a whole with paths and cycling routes to encourage exercise and to help reduce pressure on primary care. This health and wellbeing approach would hopefully appeal to growing families and help to attract a younger demographic to the County.
- There would be an on-going evaluation of healthcare and social provision for the development.
- The indicative splits given for the 665 affordable homes was based on Council projections of housing needs. If going forward these projections changed and they showed an increase in the need for 4/5 beds homes for example, this would be addressed.
- The Larger homes referred to in paragraph 3.5, Table 1 of the report referred to plot size and not the number of bedrooms.
- Councillors expressed their hope that the delivery of 30% of affordable homes would further encourage a younger demographic to the County.
- The three form primary school proposed was based partly on national standards and supplemented by local knowledge, taking into account housing mix and the existing population.
- Building a new school would present an exciting opportunity to address the problem of lack of space which existed in many of Rutland primary schools. Built into the design would be drop-off points, parking and extra space for expansion so wraparound care including nursery provision could be provided.

Before voting on the recommendations of the report, Mr G Brown brought to Cabinet's attention a summary of the Public's response to the Local Plan consultation. A further pre-submission consultation would take place in early 2019.

805 responses to the Local Plan were received. Some of the comments many of which had been addressed in the evolving Master Plan included:

- A desire by some not to have any development whatsoever.
- The view that the area was a greenfield site despite the legal designation.
- Concern over hedgerows and wildlife
- Concern over sewerage and Rutland water
- Concern that shops in Oakham and Uppingham would be affected
- Comment that minerals were not required (It was noted that Rutland was a mineral authority and there was a duty on the Council to ensure mineral planning was done in line with the law).
- Concern over the lack of public transport
- Desire for more renewable energy

## **DECISIONS:**

Cabinet unanimously agreed that, subject to amendments based on discussions held at the meeting that they would

### **1. NOTE;**

- i. the indicative timeline for the St George's project at Appendix 4; and

- ii. that a monthly progress report will continue to be provided to Cabinet on the progress of the evolving master plan and the HIF business case highlighting any significant changes.

2. **RECOMMEND** to Council;

- i. The approval of the submission of a business case for Forward Funding under the Housing Infrastructure programme based on the evolving master plan (Appendix 1)

Reasons for the decision

*The current evolution of the master plan for St George's is based on the optimal number of homes to create a new sustainable community with appropriate infrastructure and mitigation against the impact of development. It represents a plan for the site with appropriate infrastructure.*

*The HIF submission will ensure that funding is available to support delivery of appropriate infrastructure but most importantly will ensure infrastructure is delivered at the beginning of the development and in some instances in advance of any house building. Most notably the highways improvements.*

*In recognition that the St George's site is a redundant brownfield site and that MOD have a duty to maximise the site potential (in this instance through housing), the evolving master plan and HIF submission represent an opportunity to ensure that the St George's site is delivered in a way that delivers a new sustainable community that is right for Rutland as a County.*

---o0o---

*The leader called a short adjournment of the meeting.*

*Representatives from the Ministry of Defence and ReGenco left the meeting.*

*Mr G. Brown left the meeting*

---o0o---

**485 BARROWDEN AND WAKERLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUBMISSION DRAFT**

Report No.215/2018 was received from the Strategic Director for Places.

Mr O Hemsley introduced the report the purpose of which was to seek Cabinet's authorisation to carry out consultation on the proposed Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan followed by submission to an independent examiner and holding of a local referendum.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- A huge amount of work went into producing a neighbourhood plan so it made sense for neighbouring communities with similar aspirations, even if, as in this case, it involved adjacent but differing counties, to join together.
- As the majority of the population of the area involved resided in Rutland, Rutland County Council (RCC) would act as the chief counting officer and oversee the referendum, but would act in consultation with East Northants District Council. Voting in the referendum would be carried out in the localities.

## **DECISIONS:**

Cabinet:

1. **AUTHORISED** publication of the Submission Draft Barrowden & Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan, for consultation with the local community and key stakeholders.
2. **AUTHORISED** submission of the document and supporting information to an independent examiner appointed by the Council in order to carry out an examination of the plan.
3. **AUTHORISED** the Strategic Director for Places to:
  - i. undertake the statutory consultation required as part of the submission procedure and on completion of that consultation, prepare a post-submission Statement of Consultation for consideration by the independent examiner; and
  - ii. prepare the necessary documentation to accompany the Submission Draft Document through the local referendum process, including consultation and publicity material
  - iii. appoint an independent examiner to carry out an examination of the Barrowden & Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan and, following receipt of the examiner's report, to organise a local referendum to consider the Neighbourhood Plan.
4. **AUTHORISED** the Strategic Director for Places, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Rutland One Public Estate & Growth, Tourism & Economic Development and Resources (other than Finance) to:
  - i. identify, in consultation with Barrowden & Wakerley Parish Councils, any such minor changes to the Submission Draft Barrowden & Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan that may be required in response to representations received and submit them to the independent examiner.
  - ii. seek to determine, in consultation with Barrowden & Wakerley Parish Councils, any modifications identified in the independent examiner's report before it can proceed to the referendum; and
  - iii. agree any changes to the referendum area if recommended by the independent examiner.

### *Reasons for the decision*

*The submission draft Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan is considered to comply with the statutory requirements for submission of a neighbourhood plan to a*

*local authority. It is recommended that it be publicised and submitted for independent examination as required by legislation and regulations.*

---o0o---

Mr G Brown returned to the meeting

---o0o---

## **486 MID-YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT**

Report No. 235/2018 was received from the Chief Executive.

Mr O. Hemsley introduced the report the purpose of which was to provide Cabinet with strategic oversight of the Council's performance for 2018/19 in delivering the Corporate Plan Aims and Objectives. Members were accountable for the delivery of the Council's Corporate Plan and this monitoring information reported on progress and highlighted any key challenges.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- At the Cabinet's request a lighter touch report had been provided.
- Average progress scores from KS1 to KS2 in Reading, Writing and Mathematics had not achieved positive progress but it was highlighted that the percentages could be affected by very small numbers and sometimes it was just related to the particular cohort that year.
- Although most of the schools were academies and therefore outside of the Council's direct control, there was a real community will by all to move children forward.
- In order to move children beyond just achieving predicted results there needed to be a focus not just on the depth but also the breadth of the curriculum and a collective sharing of resources to achieve this.
- The number of children subject to a Child Protection Plan (CPP) for a second time was, at 26%, higher than the national average of 20.5% but represented a very small number of children (6 out of 23 currently on a CPP) and it was felt that it was better to be fully engaged with children and their families rather than to try and chase percentages. The families involved were closely monitored and fully supported.

### **DECISION:**

1. That Cabinet **NOTED** the overall position in relation to performance so far during 2018/19 and the actions being taken to address areas of underperformance.

### *Reasons for the decision*

*At the end of Quarter 2, 96% of indicators measured were on or above target with 4% of indicators (2) currently below target. Main areas of concern have been highlighted in this report and the remedial action being undertaken to improve performance has been identified.*

*Overall performance based on activity so far in 2018/19 is good.*

#### 487 RUTLAND COUNTY COUNCIL HEALTH AND SAFETY POLICY

Report No. 232/2018 was received from the Chief Executive.

Mr Gordon Brown introduced the report the purpose of which was to approve the RCC Health and Safety Policy (V0.2 draft attached as Appendix 1)

During discussion the following points were noted:

1. The Policy was a foundation on which to build from and improve procedures.
2. The emergency evacuation that had taken place the previous week at the Council had coincided with electrical work that was being done which had affected the alarms.
3. Roll calls were not done as instead there were wardens for each area who ensured that their areas had been vacated.

#### **DECISION:**

1. Cabinet **APPROVED** the attached RCC Health and Safety Policy (V0.2 draft)

#### Reasons for the decision

*A corporate health and safety policy is a legal requirement and the revision of the existing policy is essential to enable modern health and safety management practices. The new policy will provide a suitable framework to protect Council officers and members, as well as others who live, learn, work and play in and visit the County.*

#### 488 ADDITIONAL HIGHWAYS FUNDING ALLOCATION

Report No. 226/2018 was withdrawn from the agenda and would be deferred until the Cabinet meeting on 15 January 2019.

#### 489 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Cabinet **RESOLVED** that the public and press be excluded from the meeting in accordance with paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)).

#### 490. FUTURE DELIVERY OF FACILITIES MAINTENANCE SERVICES

Report No. 233/2018 with an exempt appendix was received from the Strategic Director for Places.

Mr Gordon Brown introduced the report the purpose of which was to;

1. Seek approval from Cabinet for the placement of one contract to provide Facility Management Services. This approach was being proposed for two reasons; firstly to build additional resilience into service delivery and secondly to provide a service that was more effective and efficient
2. Seek Cabinet approvals as set out in the recommendations of the report. The approvals requested would ensure that the contract could be placed with the minimum of delays.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- Concerns were expressed about the motivation of staff if they were not working directly for the Council.
- The Council needed to be sensitive to the needs of the members of staff involved.

## **DECISIONS:**

Cabinet:

1. **ENDORSED** the proposal to contract out Facilities Management as one package of works.
2. **AUTHORISED** the Head of Property Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Property Services and the Director of Resources to determine a procurement route, award criteria and if a suitable supplier or suppliers were identified to move forward and award a contract.
3. **AUTHORISED** the Head of Property Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Property Services and the Director of Resources to amend the scope of the project to ensure that the project was of a sufficient size to attract competitive bids.
4. **AUTHORISED** the Head of Property Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Property Services and the Director of Resources to extend, where required, existing contracts to ensure a smooth transition to the new arrangements.

---o0o---

After debate and decision on this item the Cabinet **APPROVED** that the meeting should return to public session.

---o0o---

## **491. ANY ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The following items of urgent business were received from the Chief Executive:

1. The bid to Homes England for funding of £130k to support the preparation of the business case had been successful. The grant conditions specified that the spending had to be in line with the reasons outlined in the bid and there was also a caveat that funding could be withdrawn if the HIF was not submitted. Therefore funds would not be drawn down until Council had agreed to submit the bid.
2. The Digital Rutland team had secured funding of £10k to stimulate take up of superfast fibre broadband. The Council would have to match this fund by £5k and there was money available to do this. The funding would be used to target specific areas of low take-up as overall Rutland had a higher than average take-up rate.
3. The Chief Executive praised the excellent work done by the Digital Rutland team who had put together a much larger bid for £2 million of funding and were shortly to present it.

**DECISION:**

1. Cabinet **AGREED** to accept the grant from Homes England to support the preparation of the HIF business case and **NOTED** the conditions.
2. Cabinet **AGREED** to support the Digital Rutland funding award of £10k with a further £5k of spending.

---o0o---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 11.40am

---o0o---