

## MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK COUNCIL** held in the King Edmund Chamber - Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Thursday, 26 July 2018- 5:30PM

### PRESENT:

Councillor:           Derrick Haley (Chair)  
                          John Levantis (Vice-Chair)

Councillors:	Roy Barker	Gerard Brewster
	Michael Burke	David Burn
	Rachel Eburne	Paul Ekpenyong
	John Field	Julie Flatman
	Nick Gowrley	Kathie Guthrie
	Lavinia Hadingham	Matthew Hicks
	Glen Horn	Barry Humphreys MBE
	Diana Kearsley	Anne Killett
	Sarah Mansel	Wendy Marchant
	John Matthissen	Lesley Mayes
	Suzie Morley	Dave Muller
	Mike Norris	Penny Otton
	Andrew Stringer	Keith Welham
	Kevin Welsby	John Whitehead
	Jill Wilshaw	

### In attendance:

Chief Executive (AC)  
Strategic Director (KN)  
Strategic Director (JS)  
Assistant Director – Planning for Growth (TB)  
Assistant Director – Law and Governance (EY)  
Corporate Manager – Democratic Services (JR)  
Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning (RH)

## 27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

27.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Caston, Councillor Gibson Harries, Councillor Jewson, Councillor Storey, Cllr Whybrow and Councillor Green.

## 28 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS

28.1 Declarations of interest were declared by the following councillors:-

- (i) **Councillor Horn, being a Director of MSDC (Suffolk Holdings), declared a local non - pecuniary interest in Item 14 and 16 MC/18/14 Capital**

**Investment Fund Company (CIFCO Capital LTD) Business Trading and Performance Report 2017/18.**

- (ii) Councillor Haley, being a Board Member of CIFCO, declared a local non-pecuniary interest in Item 14 and 16, MC/18/14 Capital Investment Fund Company (CIFCO Capital LTD) Business Trading and Performance Report 2017/18.**
- (iii) Councillor Brewster, being a Director of MSDC (Suffolk Holdings), declared a local non - pecuniary interest in Item 14 and 16 MC/18/14 Capital Investment Fund Company (CIFCO Capital LTD) Business Trading and Performance Report 2017/18.**
- (iv) Councillor Whitehead, being a Director of Gateway 14 LTD, declared a local non - pecuniary interest in Item 14 and 16 MC/18/14 Capital Investment Fund Company (CIFCO Capital LTD) Business Trading and Performance Report 2017/18.**

**(v)**

**29 MC/18/10 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21 JUNE 2018**

**It was Resolved: -**

**That subject to Councillor Osborne being added to the list of apologies, Councillor Eburne's question relating to the annual monitoring report, and the Leader's response with regard to the Joint Local Plan timetable being added into the Leader's announcements, the Minutes be approved as a true record.**

**30 MC/18/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

30.1 The Chairman asked Council to note his report and also reported that he was sharing more engagements with the Deputy Chairman to ensure that the Council was represented at as many events as possible.

**31 MC/18/12 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

31.1 The Chairman invited the Leader to introduce his report.

31.2 Councillor Gowrley presented his report and sent his deepest sympathy and respect to the family of Maggie Staddon, an officer of the Council who had died very suddenly.

31.3 Councillor Otton reiterated his sentiments with regards to Maggie Staddon.

31.4 Commenting further Councillor Otton then asked the Leader if his recent reorganisation of the Cabinet would actually reduce the increase to Members allowances that was stated in the last Council Minutes.

31.5 In response the Leader confirmed that the Lead Member position that Councillor Morley had recently occupied had been removed, which would result in a reduction of costs.

31.6 Councillor Stringer sought clarification on which Cabinet Member was responsible for housing delivery.

31.7 In response Councillor Gowrley stated that he needed to discuss this further with the Housing Portfolio Holder but he felt that housing delivery was a housing issue not a planning issue. However, it could fall between housing and assets and investments depending on what the housing delivery was. Once he had discussed this further he would then make that information available.

31.8 Councillor Otton also asked the Leader if the Council or any other Councils' in Suffolk were making preparations for a Brexit "no deal"

31.9 In response the Leader confirmed that the Council was keeping a watching brief and would respond accordingly.

**32 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

32.1 The Corporate Manager for Democratic Services reported that two petitions had been received. The first petition had sixty - eight valid signatures and was expressing opposition to a planning application for an event venue at Rockylls Hall in Shelland. The second petition expressed opposition for a planning application DC/18/02380 land east of Poplar Hill Stowmarket. Both petitions would be dealt with through the planning process.

**33 QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

33.1 There were questions received from the public.

**34 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

**Question 1**

**Councillor Eburne to Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

As per the recently released Joint Annual Monitoring Report for 2017/18, what is the Mid Suffolk District Council work plan to ensure 454 homes are completed in this financial year (2018/19) and 780 homes are completed in the next financial year (2019/2020), thus ensuring retention of a Five-Year Housing Land Supply?

### **Response Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

As Councillor Eburne will be aware, there is more to 'ensuring retention of a five-year housing land supply' than housing completions, although I recognise that forms part of the calculations. Equally important will be to ensure that planning permissions continue to flow through the system.

The Council's own developments will form a constituent part of the overall completions and there is a detailed work programme to ensure that these flow through in a timely way. As you'll be aware, it is more difficult for us to stimulate private developers to bring forward completions as there are fewer tools available to us and while we are still digesting the new NPPF it does not appear to provide us with any significant new opportunities.

There is a relationship here with your second question though so I will provide more detail in response to that question.

### **Supplementary Question Councillor Eburne to Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

I am aware that the key issue is that we've got 454 homes to deliver in this financial year, 780 in the next year, 1,150 in the year after and 1,134 the year after that and if we don't have a plan to deliver those, then we are going to be in trouble again and the 5 year land supply will be short lived, Cllr Horn refers to the few of the tools available to us as well as those in the new NPPF Paragraph 76 refers to a tool for example that's available which is having a shorter timescale. However, I think it is very important that we should also be having discussions with the developers. Is this something that the Council will try to bring forward and make sure that housing is happening. When will there be a plan as to how Mid Suffolk is actually going to help assist with getting these housing completions given the numbers are so much greater than any numbers we've achieved in the past 5 years?

### **Response Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

We are still working with developers. This is not something new that we will start doing. We have been doing it for quite some time. The housing delivery test in planning terms will become a phrase that becomes very common over the next few years because that's going to be a significant contribution to our success. What I think is a relevant and a point that has been raised is the relationship between the planning system and housing delivery. The planning system cannot be fully relied on entirely to deliver housing. It is also about relationships, how we work with our partners to bring them forward and using the tools that are at our disposal.

I would just caution against the law of unintended consequences as well as any knee jerk reactions to bringing in policies that we think will be effective in one area that actually cause us significant problems in the future. So we do need to digest what that might mean, if we're bringing forward short term planning constraints and trying to force people to bring things in a very short period of time, how does that actually align with a 20 year plan or potentially a 10 year development plan for a strategic site? I would urge caution but will be working closely with Councillor Gowrley and Councillor Wilshaw to ensure the planning system supports housing

delivery as much as possible

## **Question 2**

### **Councillor Eburne to Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

At the approval of the Mid Suffolk District Council budget 2018/19 on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 it was agreed to appoint someone to work towards “unblocking” approved housing development sites that had stalled and therefore not yet commenced. Has this person started work and, if so, what have they been working on?

#### **Answer:**

Unfortunately while a job role was created, put through job evaluation panel and advertised, the recruitment process was ultimately unsuccessful. The pool of candidates was not strong and bearing in mind the importance of developing a strategy to address stalled sites, and delivery more generally, officers have engaged with potential consultants and have now have an agreement in place with Navigus Planning that they will deliver the following activity:

1. Construct a stalled sites database to enable analysis to be undertaken of sites that have potential implementation and delivery issues.
2. Develop an approach to engaging with relevant stakeholders to understand the reasons for housing sites stalling.
3. Engage with those stakeholders to understand issues and confirm reasons for stalled sites and possible actions to address the issues.
4. Develop Council strategy for addressing issues with stalled sites.
5. Engage with officers, Members and other relevant parties, as advised by the Council, regarding progress and actions.

Through this approach Navigus will work with senior officers, and help upskill other officers, to address issues that are hampering the efficient delivery of sites and use all of the tools available to the Councils so that we can help stimulate delivery more quickly.

I understand that you have seen the recent work from Oliver Letwin at a national level which indicates that ‘land banking’ is not a significant factor. Having only recently taken on the Cabinet Member responsibilities I am still digesting this myself to understand the constraints on market delivery and the options available to us. Like you, I recognise that this is a significant and important area of work over the coming months and years.

35.1 The Leader introduced the Cabinet Member reports and invited questions from Members: -

**CMU16 Councillor Gowley, Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Investment**

**Q1. Councillor Marchant to Councillor Gowley**

Page 15 Paragraph 3.4 Councillor Marchant welcomed the plans for the new library and internet café but asked if it would be possible to include an exhibition area within the plans where local artefacts could be displayed?

**Response Councillor Gowley, Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Investment**

There may be other plans for Needham Market where this may be more suitable but we will certainly consider this.

**Q2 Councillor Eburne to Councillor Gowley**

With reference to how the Council utilises its assets – when is the Council going to utilise its assets and borrow some money to set up a housing company?

**Response Councillor Gowley, Leader and Cabinet Member for Assets and Investment**

I am pleased to say that it is under consideration at the moment.

**CMU17 Councillor Flatman, Cabinet Member for Communities**

Councillor Flatman drew attention to two errors contained in the report, the reference to Lavenham in paragraph 4.2 should be replaced with the wording in Paragraph 3.1 and although the dates for the Parish Liaison Group were correct, the venue should read Walsham le Willows.

**Q1 Councillor Welham to Councillor Flatman, Cabinet Member for Communities**

With regard to paragraph 3.8 the Womens' Cycling Tour, I understood that schools would be provided with resources so that they could work on various aspects, Members would receive some details of what these resources would be so that they could work with the schools. Freeman Primary School in Stowupland didn't receive anything. If the event were to occur again I think the Council should make more effort to ensure that these resources are provided in a timely fashion, also does the Council have a plan for the legacy provided by this event?

**Response Councillor Flatman, Cabinet Member for Communities**

It is my understanding that all schools were sent a pack with what was on offer. I take your point on member involvement and will make sure that members are the

first to know with any future events.

**CMU18 Councillor Brewster, Cabinet Member for Economy**

**Q1 Councillor Norris to Councillor Brewster, Cabinet Member for Economy**

Under Page 26 Paragraph 4.4 the Open for Business Team will be progressing the Needham Lake Visitor Centre priority work stream by working up a feasibility specification on commissioning the next stage of this project – will there be a timetable for the progression of this project?

**Response Councillor Brewster, Cabinet Member for Economy**

I am sure there will be a timetable produced and as soon as it is, it will be made available to you and other members.

**Q2 Councillor Otton to Councillor Brewster, Cabinet Member for Economy**

I am not sure if this is commercially sensitive information but on commissioning Nautilus Associates Development phase 1 feasibility do we have a costing for that and would that be available to members?

**Response Councillor Brewster, Cabinet Member for Economy**

I will make enquiries on that as to the confidentiality of the information. If it is available I will make sure that you see it.

**CMU19 Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

**Q1 Councillor Otton to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

Has any consideration been given to using street lamps as charging points for electric vehicles which I believe is happening in other parts of the country?

**Response Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

It is certainly possible to use the electricity supply that is at street lamp positions to mount charging points on the street lamps or by the side of the street lamps. However, I am unable to answer the question directly, so I will find out and let you know.

**Q2 Councillor Marchant to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

Could you tell us more about the childrens' activities planned for Needham Lake?

**Response to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

Unfortunately, I have not got the details to hand, so will send them to ward members.

### **Q3 Councillor Field to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

Under 3.13 with relation to the County Council cutting recycling performance payments does this solely affect the collection authority or does it ripple down to the Parish Councils and others who do have sites albeit of a smaller nature and if so have they been informed of the changes? Also, whilst I am clearly pleased to see we are taking action with the Fison's building please can you keep local members informed?

### **Response Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

With regard to the second question relating to Fison's – yes, I will make sure you are informed as for the first question I will ask Councillor Barker to respond

### **Response Councillor Barker, Lead Member for Waste**

We in Mid Suffolk and Babergh are one of the few councils in Suffolk to actually pass on recycling credits down to our charities and we will be continuing to do that for as long as I can foresee.

### **Q4 Councillor Stringer to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

My question relates to the Fison's building which is obviously an iconic building, the report suggests that we have already been working in a robust way but we have got to this impasse - where do you think this action will lead us on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being where the building gets flattened or 10 gets it beautifully rebuilt)?

### **Response Chief Executive**

We are clearly talking about a matter that is subject to ongoing legal proceedings therefore any conversations should be taken outside of the public realm.

### **Q5 Councillor Matthissen to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

Given that global issues are undermining market prices for recyclable materials and the 22 streams of recycling that I understand are dealt with in one way or another in the County. What initiatives are we going to take to actually try and reduce the quantities that arise through these various processes? Secondly, can we ensure that with the electric vehicle charging points provision is included in the points for people with disabilities can charge their electric buggies and indeed also for electric bikes?

### **Response: Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

I will refer your first question to Councillor Barker, with regard to your second question that is a good point and I will make sure that I take this up with the officer concerned to ensure that the charging points can cope with all those requirements.

### **Response: Councillor Barker, Lead Member for Waste**



We are not going to stop recycling full stop. Up to now we have been making money out of the commodities, as a Farmer I don't pack up because we lose money one year we keep going. The main thing is that we keep pushing recycling. We have got higher levels of recycling. The good news is that the stuff that's produced from the incinerator is now actually recyclable and that can also be used as part of our recycling target percentage.

**Q6 Councillor Mansel to Councillor Burn, Cabinet Member for the Environment**

In the table on paragraph 3.9 about annual growth in garden waste subscription could you please tell me what the units are?

**Response: Councillor Barker, Lead Member for Waste.**

The units mentioned are the number of subscribers which equates to the number of bins whichever is the easiest for you to write down.

**CMU20 Councillor Whitehead Cabinet Member for Finance.**

**Q1 Councillor Eburne to Councillor Whitehead**

Under paragraph 3.17 with regard to the SRP savings and the accumulated savings of £3.76m – what does that actually mean for Mid Suffolk? Secondly at paragraph 4.1 the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), in February we discussed the MTFS and were sent a note saying it was based on projected completions etc, given that those figures have now increased massively can the Member for Finance assure me that those figures will go into the new MTFS because it will make it look very different?

**Response: Councillor Whitehead, Cabinet Member for Finance.**

I take your point to some extent on paragraph 3.17 in terms of making big numbers by rolling them together. However, SRP was a joint initiative between three councils so I think it is important to see where the total savings have been made. With regard to the MTFS my hope would be that on the basis of doing zero based budgeting as a matter of course we would effectively almost start from a blank piece of paper when we come to recalculate these for the next budget year.

**Q2 Councillor Otton to Councillor Whitehead, Cabinet Member for Finance.**

With regards to paragraph 3.17 should we actually be celebrating this? I would like to know where the actual savings have come from considering the highly sensitive work that the SRP undertakes. Also your statement at 3.3 which states that planning fees and community infra-structure levy contributed to a favourable end of year position but then go on to say that these will be transferred to specific reserves. Do these two paragraphs contradict each other because after all the money is there for other purposes?

**Response Councillor Whitehead, Cabinet Member for Finance.**

I don't really see there is a contradiction in so far as these various initiatives contributed to a favourable end of year position, that is really a statement of fact. I agree that CIL may be seen as a bit of a strange one as it is ring fenced money, but it does come in and straight in the reserve account. The reality is that it is useful to have that sort of magnitude of outturn. With regards to your point about SRP, by putting three organisations together to create SRP we have been able to achieve quite some significant economies of scale and everything I see by sitting on that committee is that we continue to meet all of our targets and that is something that should be celebrated.

### **Q3 Councillor Field to Councillor Whitehead, Cabinet Member for Finance**

Under paragraph 3.14 there are figures about council tax collected which are very high and I'm inclined to suggest that we celebrate this. I note there was a parliamentary report about government bodies adopting rather aggressive attitudes towards debt collection, excessive use of bailiffs and the impact that this has on people's mental health and life. I would like assurance that although we are achieving excellent figures we are doing that with recognition of the knock-on cost if we are too aggressive in our attitudes?

### **Response Councillor Whitehead, Cabinet Member for Finance.**

The SRP is as you know shared with Ipswich Borough Council, Babergh and Mid Suffolk. I suspect Ipswich Borough Council is more cautious than perhaps ourselves in terms of the needs for collections. It is a difficult one because for any amount that is not collected everyone else has to bear the burden. Our percentage rates for collection stack up very well against the sort of averages that are seen nationwide. However we are feeding back the need to collect as much as possible but in a fair and sensible way.

### **CMU21 Councillor Wilshaw Cabinet Member for Housing**

Q1 Councillor Matthissen to Councillor Wilshaw Cabinet Member for Housing

We are proposing a very high number of affordable houses on the Needham Market Middle School Site and in your report it states that there was minimal feedback on the proposals, I have certainly heard feedback from Members including Ward Members can you confirm that you are happy that we are doing the right thing here and would you reconsider?

### **Response Councillor Wilshaw Cabinet Member for Housing**

Thank you we are considering all options available to us so watch this space.

### **Q2 Councillor Stringer to Councillor Wilshaw, Cabinet Member for Housing**

With regards to housing delivery - in the annual monitoring report there are more houses being built in one type of area than others, I have done some analysis and it appears that the primary villages have washed our face this time while the urban

centres have slightly dwindled. Do we have an accurate analysis of this as its imperative that we understand where our housing delivery is being successful and the areas where it isn't. I also ask that we need to do this analysis quickly as we are almost through a quarter of the year already to deliver the 606 units that we need to deliver?

**Response Councillor Gowrley, Leader of the Council**

Yes, we will be addressing that issue shortly. There is a report later on in the agenda relating to the timetable for the Joint Local Plan Development scheme and that information will be required for the Plan.

34.2 Councillor Eburne raised a point of order relating to not being able to discuss items not included in the Cabinet Member's report and requested that current processes were reviewed.

**Q4 Councillor Mansel to Councillor Wilshaw, cabinet Member for Housing**

Can I ask what is the position on the possible disbandment of the Joint Housing Board and has the creation of a Tenant Board as I was particularly keen to establish have some sort of Member involvement?

**Response Councillor Wilshaw Cabinet Member for Housing**

I have checked with the Assistant Director for Housing and they are still working on the how the new proposals would work

**Q5 Councillor Otton to Councillor Wilshaw Cabinet Member for Housing**

With regard to your report on universal credit, you state that you have three tenancy support officers who are only working one day a week at each of these job centres. Please could you clarify where it says tenancy, are these for local authority tenants or are they for all tenants and are those officers qualified to actually give debt advice? Please also confirm whether you are paying the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) for help and support?

**Response Councillor Wilshire: Cabinet Member for Housing**

Councillor Gowrley and I are in discussion with the Assistant Director for Housing regarding universal credit and possibility of using CAB to support this.

34.3 Councillor Gowrley, being a trustee of the Stowmarket CAB declared a non-pecuniary interest and also for Councillor Wilshaw, being a volunteer at Stowmarket CAB.

**CM22 Councillor Morley, Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery**

**Q1 Councillor Otton to Councillor Morley, Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery**

On the Council's priorities for 2018/19 it details the timetable for the "One Council business Case surely this should no longer be included?

**Response: Councillor Morley, Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery**

You are quite right that should be removed, thank you for bringing this to my attention.

**Q2 Councillor Field to Councillor Morley, Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery.**

Within your performance measures do you have any statistics on messages being left on officers phones and whether they respond to them as I have received complaints from residents that their messages are going unanswered?

**Response: Councillor Morley, Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery**

I think if the call comes through to individual officers then we are unable to measure this but I will find out and confirm this.

**CM23 Councillor Gowrley, Cabinet Member for Law and Governance.**

As the Leader and Chief Executive know, I felt that the Council was very poor in promoting National Democracy Week I would hope that that in another year we would have a much more inclusive local democracy week

**Response Chief Executive**

Just to clarify this was the very first National Democracy Week, Local Democracy Week takes place in October, obviously we will be supporting both.

**CMU24 Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

**Q1 Councillor Otton to Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

This Council appears to have a more complex CIL bidding process than other councils in Suffolk can we look at this? I would also like to ask you to have a look at a recent judicial review which appears to throw a spanner in the works for planning applications in villages in the countryside particularly outside of a settlement which may have significant implications for our villages and lastly would you have a discussion with Councillor Field relating to S106 payments for Gt Blakenham which have been hanging about for three years?

**Response Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

In reverse order, the Gt Blakenham 106 has already been raised and once I have solid answers I will make sure that all members are briefed. I am more than happy to look at other recent court rulings and other authorities' experiences. Lastly, I'm not sure our CIL bidding process is more complex as I really don't have anything to compare it with. We do have a CIL review process in place, so I would hope through

the iterations it will become more simpler and effective. We will monitor what other people are doing and we will learn from them and take those lessons up as they crop up.

### **Q3 Councillor Eburne to Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

With reference to page 48 paragraph 3.6 the Suffolk Design Guide, whilst there were lots of input from businesses at the workshops I was concerned that there was little input from Members as representatives of our communities, I would ask if you are looking at a plan to develop the Suffolk Design Guide looking at how the community element and what housing development looks like in Mid Suffolk because it is very different to what's in Ipswich and Southwold and my concern is that it will become Suffolk and not Mid Suffolk, can I have your assurance that this won't happen.

### **Response Councillor Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning**

I agree with Councillor Eburne. I would love to see more members attending these workshops. This was a launch event and there will be other workshops and seminars and I would encourage all members to attend. With regard to the specific Mid Suffolk designs I will ask the Assistant Director for Planning to respond.

### **Response Assistant Director for Planning**

To pick up the point about local community representatives, this was essentially the most significant input that Mid Suffolk and Babergh made in the original bid to MHCLG to ensure that training for community representatives parish councils and particularly neighbourhood planning groups was an inherent part of the bid that was made. Invites were also sent to the Suffolk Preservation Society and the Suffolk Association of Local Councils and representatives from both of these groups attended. A particularly complicated part of the training exercise is that in Suffolk there is probably in excess of 4,000 Parish Councillors so engaging them all is quite challenging. Mr Hemingway has a particular desire for digital engagement but some of our Parish Councillors have a particular desire not to be engaged in that way so there is a bit of tension to resolve there in terms of how you engage that mass of people and particularly pick up the points around Mid Suffolk specifically.

A key part of the communication between the project team and the design team has been to ensure that we don't end up with something bland that reflects some kind of Suffolk DNA but that it actually reflects the diversity of vernacular and communities across Suffolk from the coastal to urban to the rural to the very rural. I think what we will end up with is some kind of typology or methodology that reflects the uniqueness of different places so that's the core part of the work that will be ongoing.

## **36 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT**

36.1 The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny reported that the Overview and Scrutiny committee had agreed for this municipal year to hold alternative monthly meetings with joint meetings in between.

36.2 Commenting further the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny reported that the

Committee had scrutinised two key matters at their June and July meetings.

36.3 At the June meeting Members had received a report from the Cabinet Member for Housing on the first year of trading for BMBS and had scrutinised the revised business plan for 2017 to 2023. The comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be reported to Cabinet on the 6<sup>th</sup> August 2018 along with the committee's comments on the Corporate Compliments, Comments and Complaints Policy.

36.4 At the July Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the Committee looked at the CIFCO performance for 2017/18 and scrutinised the business plan for 2018/19. Members asked a number of detailed questions and were given extensive responses and an undertaking that this information would be included in the Council report. The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was pleased to see that all of this information including the Minutes from the meeting had been included in the Council report for debate that had been tabled this evening.

36.5 The Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee then went on to detail the future items that the Scrutiny Committee would be reviewing including: -

- The Planning pre -app fees and performance
- Disabled adaptations, grants, and the locality award scheme
- Health and Wellbeing particularly staff turnover and sickness and the effect of the move to Endeavour House
- Council housing void times.

## **37 MC/18/13 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME UPDATE**

37.1 Councillor Horn introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations within the report.

37.2 Commenting further Councillor Horn stated that the Local development Scheme was the work programme for the preparation of the Joint Local Plan. This version updated the adopted March 2017 version and introduced a number of amendments mainly revising the timetable to reflect a further round of public consultation to ensure the Joint local Plan was robust and so that the Council could take into account the comments made at the next round of public consultation before producing the draft Joint Local Plan for examination

37.3 The next version of the plan which is proposed to be published in November 2018 with public consultation from December 2018 to January 2019 would be known as the Regulation 18 draft and would effectively set out the Council's prepared position in respect of planning policies and site allocations.

37.4 Comments from the public and stakeholders will be fed back to members in March 2019 and the submission draft plan known as Regulation 19 draft will be published in the spring of March 2019 with a six- week technical consultation on the soundness and legal compliance of the document. Representations made on this plan are then submitted along with the plan to the Government for public examination. The submission plan once agreed by Council will carry weight in the

determination of planning applications.

37.5 Councillor Guthrie seconded the report and reserved the right to speak.

37.7 Councillor Killett asked in view of the now changed timetable what the risk and financial issues were to the Council for the late delivery of the plan.

37.8 In response the Corporate Manager for Strategic Planning stated that the financial details were already detailed in the report as effectively the evidenced based costs would remain the same. The examination costs remain the same. What the Council was trying to do was actually de-risk if from the examination process itself by ensuring the Plan was robust enough before submission so that the Council didn't have a period of suspension at the examination.

37.9 Councillor Eburne sought reassurance that the date would not be pushed further into the future?

37.10 In response Councillor Horn stated that he would like to very much achieve that date and the Council would do what it could to stick to the timetable.

It was Resolved:-

- (i) That the revised timetable for the preparation of the Joint Local Plan be approved and that the revised Local Development Scheme be brought into effect by 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018.

## 38 COUNCILLOR APPOINTMENTS

It was Resolved:-

- (i) That Councillor Muller be appointed Chair of the Joint Audit and Standards Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.**
- (ii) That Councillor Hadingham be appointed temporary vice chair of the Strategic Overview and Scrutiny until the return of Councillor Osborne from a period of absence.**
- (iii) That Councillor Burke be appointed Vice Chair of the Joint Audit and Standards Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.**

## 39 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

39.1 On the proposal of Councillor Matthissen and seconded by Councillor Mansel It was **MOVED** that: -

This Council notes that:-

- Community Rail Partnerships (CRP) are a useful way of promoting

tourism without generating road traffic.

- Abellio Greater Anglia offers start-up grants of £20,000 and continuing financial and practical support
- Greater Anglia supports 8 CRP's at present, and 4 of its 8 intermediate stations are in Mid Suffolk

Accordingly, Council calls on Suffolk County Council and the West Suffolk councils to join Mid Suffolk in approaching Greater Anglia to propose that work begins to launch a Mid Anglia CRP next spring.

39.2 Councillor Matthissen briefly explained that CRP's were a good way of promoting tourism and therefore bringing money into the economy without increasing road traffic. Secondly Abellio Anglia did offer start up grants to help with this. There were already eight of these community rail partnerships who were already a long way through the process of setting them up and Councillor Matthissen were concerned that Mid Suffolk would be left behind. He suggested that there were three potential CRP's that remain and looking at the railway line of the intermediate stations between Ipswich and Cambridge out of the eight stations four were actually in Mid Suffolk. Councillor Matthissen went on to say that he would like the Council to call on the County Council the lead authority on transport matters and also the West Suffolk Council to approach Greater Anglia to suggest this.

39.3 The Chairman invited Mr Feeney, an expert witness to speak on the motion.

39.4 Mr Feeney informed Council that a Community Rail Partnership (CRP) was an association between a public transport operator primarily the train operator Greater Anglia, the local authorities covered by the area and the local communities, Councillor Matthissen had mentioned the potential impact on tourism and Mr Feeny, thought it was also right to mention a wider impact on local business through businesses having the opportunity to use some railway resources in terms of developing small businesses in railway linked properties along the line. The other value of a CRP was the fact that it actually promoted public transport. Not something for tourism but for commuting further forms of travel. So from that point of view it was really about time the Mid Anglia line had a Community Rail Partnership. Mr Feeny thought this was long overdue as there was between 90 to a 100 of them throughout the country already. The line from Cambridge to Ipswich which goes through Mid Suffolk was one of a minority routes served by Greater Anglia which it had not yet got the Community Rail Partnership. The Community Rail Partnership in East Suffolk serving Felixstowe and communities through to Lowestoft had been an immense success. It was a model of what can be done with public transport both in terms of increasing passenger numbers, in terms of promoting tourism, in terms of using redundant station buildings for cafes and other businesses so there was a real template in the county that we can hopefully learn from. Mr Feeny thanked the Chair for giving him the opportunity to speak in support of the motion, he also underlined the importance of the huge benefits and thought it was a genuine win-win. There were huge benefits to having a Community Rail Partnership. There was funding. Cllr Matthissen mentioned that this comes from Greater Anglia but actually comes from the Department for Transport and the Department for Transport who through the years had been a consistent advocate for the development of Community Rail Partnerships so hopefully this will meet with



the support of Council and can progress. There is a funny kind of choreography to these things, the train operator has to set things up and get it going but the impression that we have is that the train operator has to have the vibes from the local authorities that they are keen to participate and to help it to happen and hence the notion of working in collaboration with the County Council and with partners at West Suffolk to try and expedite this as quickly as possible really. Thankyou.

39.5 In response Councillor Brewster stated that having discussed the matter with officers and noting the potential financial and resource implications associated with this activity he proposed an amendment to the Motion as follows:

“this Council notes that the Community Rail Partnerships (CRP’s) are a useful way of promoting tourism without generating road traffic. Abellio Greater Anglia offer start up grants of £20,000 and continuing financial and practical support, both of which are dependent on third party contributions. Greater Anglia supports 8 CRP’s and have just launched a ninth for the Southend line. The Mid Anglia CRP is one of three remaining CRP’s and 4 of its 8 intermediate stations are in Mid Suffolk. Accordingly Council calls on Suffolk County Council and the West Suffolk Councils to join Mid Suffolk in exploring the benefits and implications of a Mid Anglia CRP”

39.6 Councillor Gowrley seconded the amendment and reserved the right to speak.

39.7 Councillor Matthissen accepted the amendment.

39.8 The amendment was **PUT** to the meeting and **AGREED**.

**It was Resolved:-**

**That this Council notes that the Community Rail Partnerships (CRP’s) are a useful way of promoting tourism without generating road traffic. Abellio Greater Anglia offer start up grants of £20,000 and continuing financial and practical support, both of which are dependent on third party contributions. Greater Anglia supports 8 CRP’s and have just launched a ninth for the Southend line. The Mid Anglia CRP is one of three remaining CRP’s and 4 of its 8 intermediate stations are in Mid Suffolk. Accordingly, Council calls on Suffolk County Council and the West Suffolk Councils to join Mid Suffolk in exploring the benefits and implications of a Mid Anglia CRP”**

**40 MC/18/14 CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND COMPANY ('CIFCO CAPITAL LTD') BUSINESS TRADING AND PERFORMANCE REPORT 2017/2018**

40.1 Councillor Brewster introduced the report and **MOVED** the recommendations within the report.

40.2 Commenting further Councillor Brewster informed Council that the report provided the Council as a 50% shareholder with an oversight of CIFCO’s Capital LTD’s performance and activity in its first year of trading and its proposed investment strategy for the 2018/19 year forming the basis of trading in year 2. The report had been scrutinised by the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee and their

recommendations and the Minutes from that meeting were also included in the report.

40.3 Councillor Brewster then went on to welcome and introduce Mr Ian Winslet a consultant working for the Board of CIFCO to present the report.

40.4 Mr Winslet informed Council that the report reflected the financial targets that were set by the Councils in the original agreement, and that they were on target. The report also showed that six assets were acquired, with one other being acquired since the report had been written, another one had been exchanged so the Company was getting close to the full investment of £50m.

40.5 Councillor Ekpenyong seconded the report and reserved the right to speak.

40.6 Councillor Otton stated that her party and others had been unhappy about some of the investments that had been put forward and were progressing. They were particularly concerned about the reliance on the retail sector at a time when hearing of organisations in the retail business not reaching their profit targets. The other issue that they were concerned about was that the sites that had been acquired were not in the district or the county.

40.7 Councillor Stringer raised concerns relating to the diversity of the Board of Directors.

40.8 Councillor Eburne asked why only one aspect of Lord Oakeshott's report was included as several aspects of his report related to commercial property including treasury guidance changes, The PWLB changes, and reference to a Private Members Bill entitled Local Authority (Borrowing and Investment) Bill. She also asked about acquiring investments related to renewable energy, and why aspects from other reports were not included.

40.9 In response to the query relating to the diversity of the Board, Councillor Horn confirmed that a wide reaching and open recruitment process had been undertaken. The people were appointed due to their ability to deliver the strategic priorities that the holding companies had set them.

40.10 Mr Winslet in response to the question relating to the Lord Oakeshott report stated that the reason that Lord Oakeshott was mentioned in Paragraph 4.3 of the report was in response to a specific question that was asked prior to the scrutiny meeting, hence why it was felt appropriate to add it to the report.

**It was Resolved:-**

**That the CIFCO Capital Ltd trading activity and performance for the year to end April 2018 be noted.**

## **41 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC WHICH TERM INCLUDES THE PRESS**

**It was Resolved:-**

That pursuant to Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the business specified in the Minutes on the grounds that if the public were present during discussion of this item, it is likely that there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as indicated in the report.

**42 CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX - CIFCO CAPITAL LTD BUSINESS PLAN 2018/19 (EXEMPT INFORMATION BY VIRTUE OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF PART 1)**

42.1 Councillor Brewster introduced the confidential report and **MOVED** the recommendations in the report.

42.2 Councillor Field queried the figures in the Scrutiny Minutes under paragraph 6.9 relating to commercial investment market.

42.3 Mr Winslet, Development Consultant stated that the correct figures were illustrated in paragraph 4.3 of the report and confirmed that the local authority investment since 2016 amounted to £2.31 billion of total commercial property of £883 billion.

42.4 Councillor Eburne asked if the Board had looked at any opportunities for renewable energy investments such as solar farms?

42.5 In response Mr Winslet stated that the Board had not looked at this type of opportunity, as up to now the Board, rightly, in line with their business plan and the KPI's set by both Councils, had been concentrating their investment efforts on core assets and core plus assets which the type of asset described fell outside of both of these.

42.6 Councillor Stringer asked when the Board thought they would get a balanced set of investments and risk and also queried whether the Board had run a risk profile on what may or may not happen next March.

42.7 In response Mr Winslet stated that the asset allocation by sector illustrated in diagram 3 on page 85 of the confidential papers is where the Board expect the final balance to be at the end of the investment period. If the right assets come on the market then the Board expect to be fully invested by the end of this calendar year. At the moment the Board did not have a balance as they had wanted to target the core assets first. However the balance in the portfolio would exist at the time of full investment. On the Brexit discussion, JAL provide a quarterly report to the Board and within that report there is a section on Brexit and the implications, or potential implications for the commercial property sector. At the moment what we are seeing is some particular hot spots on the property sector, especially industrial assets which the Board is particularly targeting at the moment. Retail assets are the weakest which is why we will be under invested in that particular segment by the end of the investment period given the concerns that have been raised.

**It was Resolved: -**

**That the CIFCO's Capital Ltd business plan 2018/19 be approved.**

**43 MC/18/15 TO CONFIRM THE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTE OF 21 JUNE 2018 MEETING**

**It was Resolved:-**

**That the confidential Minutes of the meeting held on the 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 be approved as a true record.**

The business of the meeting was concluded at 7.45 pm.

.....

Chair