

## **MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Minutes of the meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK CABINET** held in the King Edmund Chamber - Endeavour House, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich on Monday, 10 December 2018

### **PRESENT:**

Councillor:           Nick Gowrley – Leader  
                         John Whitehead – Vice Chair

|              |                 |              |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Councillors: | Gerard Brewster | David Burn   |
|              | Julie Flatman   | Glen Horn    |
|              | Suzie Morley    | Penny Otton  |
|              | Andrew Stringer | Jill Wilshaw |

### **In attendance:**

Councillor Roy Barker  
Councillor Diana Kearsley  
Councillor Keith Welham

Executive Director (AC)  
Strategic Director (KN)  
Strategic Director (JS)  
Assistant Director – Assets and Investments (EA)  
Assistant Director – Law and Governance (EY)  
Assistant Director – Planning and Communities (TB)  
Assistant Director – Environment and Commercial Contracts (CF)  
Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning (RH)  
Corporate Business Improvement Manager  
Neighbourhood Planning Officer (PB)  
Governance Support Officer (HH)

### **79 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies received.

### **80 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY COUNCILLORS**

The following declarations of local non-pecuniary interests were declared for:

Item 5 from Councillors Nick Gowrley as Trustee of Stowmarket Citizens Advice Bureau. Councillor Jill Wilshaw as a Citizens Advice Bureau volunteer.

Item 9 from Councillors Nick Gowrley, Penny Otton and Andrew Stringer as Councillors for Suffolk County Council.

Item 12 from Councillors Julie Flatman as Ward Member for Stradbroke and Andrew Stringer for assisting Stradbroke Parish Council in the Neighbourhood planning process.

Item 15 from Councillors Glen Horn and Gerard Brewster as Members of the Board MSDC (Suffolk Holdings) Ltd. and Councillor John Whitehead as Director of Gateway 14.

**81 MCA/18/41 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 5 NOVEMBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 5 November 2018 were confirmed as a correct record with the following amendment:

Bullet point 74.10 amend the Regent Theatre to the Regal Theatre.

**82 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME**

None received.

**83 QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS**

**Councillor John Matthissen to Councillor Nick Gowrley and Councillor John Whitehead**

**“Will the Administration follow the lead of St Edmundsbury BC and FHDC in replacing CAB loss of grant from SCC with an increase in its own grants to the Stowmarket and Diss CABx, for the Budget 2019/20 now being drafted?**

**My earlier plea for this remains unanswered, so it is repeated below, together with a link to the recent media story.”**

**Citizens Advice among good causes set for West Suffolk funding after county council grant cut (online) MSDC**

**Response**

*Councillor Whitehead:*

Before I answer on behalf of Mid Suffolk, I think it is important to mention the press article that you have referred to about St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath Councils. That article simply confirms that, unlike Suffolk County Council, St

Edmundsbury and Forest Heath Councils are continuing to fund their CABs. I am happy to confirm that Mid Suffolk also recognises the significant contribution made by Stowmarket CAB, and others in Diss, Ipswich and Bury St Edmunds and intends to continue to fund them as we have been doing.

We provided core revenue funding of £87,600 for each of the last two financial years, together with other financial support through Councillor Locality Awards and our Small Grants scheme. In addition, we are bringing a report to Cabinet shortly that will seek to put in place a rolling three-year funding programme for the CAB. This is designed to provide them with greater certainty and security to plan for the future.

Finally, I would like to return briefly to the issue of the County Council funding, which prompted your question. The County Council's original proposal was to remove all financial support for all Suffolk CABs from April 2019. Since your question was submitted this proposal has been revised so that half of the County Council funding would continue in 2019/2020 before reducing to zero in 2020/2021. At this stage however, these simply remain proposals and the County Council will, like us, be setting its budget in February 2019.

We have already been in contact with the CAB to work with them to ensure that the vulnerable residents of Mid Suffolk, and the surrounding area, continue to receive the excellent support provided by our CAB.

**84 MATTERS REFERRED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY OR JOINT AUDIT AND STANDARDS COMMITTEES**

There were no matters referred from the Overview and Scrutiny and Joint Audit and Standards Committees.

**85 MCA/18/42 FORTHCOMING DECISIONS LIST**

The Forthcoming Decisions List was noted.

**86 MCA/18/43 QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE OUTCOME REPORTING**

86.1 Councillor Morley, Cabinet Member for Organisational Delivery introduced report MCa/18/43 and MOVED the recommendations 3.1 on page 11, which was seconded by Councillor Julie Flatman.

86.2 Councillor Otton detailed several questions she had received answers to previously, and informed Members that the issues with the bed and breakfast accommodation had been resolved now that the utilities at the Foyer had become available. She also said that the Council had been awarded discretionary housing grants against the targets but that this had to be monitored for the rest of the year. Something wrong here, I think Cllr Wilshaw spoke about the Foyer and the dhg?

- 86.3 She explained that The Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) was coping with budgeting without intervention but awaiting final information of what was expected of the Bureau for the authorities.
- 86.2 She continued asking if the 63% the market share of the building control applications which had been processed was because the market share had gone down, and the income had gone up. Jonathan Stephenson – Strategic Director - responded that the percentage of the market share for building control was a result of the more profitable work that building control was undertaking.
- 86.3 She then referred to the Performance Report and asked for clarification of why the Business rates paid by Direct Debit was such a small percentage and received a response explaining that the rest was paid by BASC.
- 86.4 Councillor Stringer was concerned that if there was no target set for the number of dwellings approved (need some detail as to what he's referring to) and asked if this could be included in the performance measure? He also asked if it was possible to have estimated figures for completed house builds?
- 86.5 Members considered how to measure the above questions and that there was no correlation between the number of planning applications and completed dwellings and that it was difficult determine a target.
- 86.6 The Cabinet Member for Planning agreed to remove the target for number of dwellings approved and include a figure for the number of dwellings completed.
- 86.7 In a response to questions regarding measuring fly tipping in the Performance measure, the Cabinet Member for Environment agreed to review how fly tipping was measured and to include figures for the number of bags and lorry loads collected when clearing up after fly tipping incidents.
- 86.8 The Lead Member for Waste agreed that a quarterly estimate for fly tipping would useful.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED: -**

**That the performance report and the performance outcome information tabled at Appendices A to G be agreed as a reflection Mid Suffolk District Council's performance for July to September 2018.**

**Reason for Decision**

To provide assurance that the Council is meeting its performance objectives.

**87 MCA/18/44 PROPOSAL FOR A NEW INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT FROM SUFFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL FROM 2019 - 2024**

- 87.1 Councillor David Burn, Cabinet Member for Waste introduced report MCA/18/44 and MOVED the recommendation 3.1 page 51, which was seconded by Councillor Julie Flatman.
- 87.2 Councillor Otton asked why a similar report for the same service, which had been presented to Suffolk County Council had detailed a reduction in cost, when the report before Members today detailed an increase in costs.
- 87.3 The Assistant Director – Environment and Commercial Partnerships, responded that the two reports were referring to two different facilities. He then clarified paragraph 4.10 and that by taking food waste out of the household waste would have an impact on the costs.
- 87.4 Councillor Stringer enquired if the report was based on current cost of the services.
- 87.5 It was clarified that the report did not refer to the MRF (Materiel Recovery Facility) payment from SCC to the District Council of £54.76. There was a gate fee of £10 per tonne which was in place until May 2019. For the contract being discussed the gate fee was likely to reach a cost of £25 per tonne, for which SCC had agreed to refund 50% of any cost above £25.
- 87.6 Councillor Barker added there was an incentive to recycle due to the cost of household waste, and that a SWP was working to improve the recycling of materials. One emerging new issue was the collection of medical sharps from households, which would need to be addressed in the future.
- 87.7 It was pointed out that paragraph 3.5 on page 77 of the report detailed the fixed annual lump sum payments for third party recycling support.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:** -

**That the Cabinet approves entering into a further 5-year period of the Inter Authority Agreement between the Waste Collection Authorities and the Waste Disposal Authority.**

**Reason for Decision**

Working collaboratively across the Suffolk Waste Partnership benefits both the Waste Disposal Authority and Waste Collections Authorities in setting out clearly both the working arrangements and recycling performance payments.

**88 MCA/18/45 MODERN SLAVERY POLICY**

88.1 Councillor John Whitehead, the Cabinet Member for Finance introduced Report MCa/18/45 and MOVED the recommendation on page 79, which was supported by Councillor Suzie Morley.

88.2 Councillor Otton and Councillor Stringer both expressed their supported the policy and Members agreed that this was a good policy.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:** -

**That the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Policy on Modern Slavery be adopted.**

**Reason for Decision**

To enhance the Council's commitment to operate ethically and to contribute to the elimination of modern slavery.

**89 MCA/18/46 DEBENHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

89.1 Councillor Glen Horn, Cabinet Member for Planning introduced Report MCa/18/46. He then introduced Steve Palframan, the Chair of Debenham Parish Council and Mike Hammond, member of the Debenham Parish Council.

89.2 Mr Palframan said it had taken the Parish Council six and a half years to complete the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan, but that officers from the Council had assisted and advised throughout the process. He thanked the staff for their support.

89.3 Councillor Horn drew Members attention to the following benefits of the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan:

- The Plan provided for around 316 dwellings to be built across three sites during the plan period (2016 – 2036).
- The Plan contained other policies that
  - required all developers to take account of the need for smaller (2-bed and 3-bed) properties to address the needs of both young and older generations;
  - promoted sustainable modes of transport and better connectivity via footpaths etc;
  - allocated a number of local green spaces;
  - identified 14 'highly valued views' that look both in to and out of the village.

- 89.4 Councillor Horn MOVED the recommendations, which was seconded by Councillor Morley.
- 89.5 In response to Councillor Stringer's questions the Chair of Debenham Parish Council clarified that the Council had identified seven sites for development, and that it had been determined how many dwellings the village could manage based on the statistics available. He also said that the planning application was not part of the neighbourhood plan.
- 89.6 Councillor Barker congratulated the Parish Council on completing the plan and said that neighbourhood plans carried weight at this stage, when the Planning Committee determined planning application in the village.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:** -

- 1.1 That Debenham Parish Council be requested to make the necessary modifications to their Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with the Examiners recommendations**
- 1.2 That, subject to the satisfactory outcome of the above (to be agreed by the Corporate Manager for Strategic Planning), the Neighbourhood Plan be advanced to a local referendum covering the parish of Debenham**

**Reason for Decision**

To enable the Council to meet its statutory obligation under Section 17A of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and to allow the Debenham Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to a local referendum.

**90 MCA/18/47 STRADBROKE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

- 90.1 Councillor Glen Horn introduced Report MCA/18/47 and forwarded an apology from Chris Edwards the Chair of Stradbroke Parish Council.
- 90.2 Councillor Horn MOVED recommendations 3.1 and 3.2, page 93, which was seconded by Councillor Julie Flatman.
- 90.3 He then detailed some of the benefits of the Stradbroke Neighbourhood Plan including:
- That the Plan provided for minimum 219 dwellings across five sites to be built during the plan period (2016 – 2036)
  - That the Plan contained other policies that:
    - Required proposals for 5 or more units to deliver at least 40% of these as

- one-bed or two-bed properties (30% as one-bed);
  - Sought to manage surface water flooding;
  - protected existing community infrastructure and encourage new;
  - allocated four Local Green Space;
  - required that all development contribute towards the village's local distinctiveness.
- 90.4 The Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning, informed Members that Neighbourhood Plans carried weight at the planning stage following publication of the Examiner's report and they became part of the development plan for the Council when the result of the referendum was announced.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:** -

- 1.1 That Stradbroke Parish Council be requested to make the necessary modifications to their Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with the Examiners recommendations.**
- 1.2 That, subject to the satisfactory outcome of the above (to be agreed by the Corporate Manager for Strategic Planning), the Neighbourhood Plan be advanced to a local referendum covering the parish of Stradbroke.**

**Reason for Decision**

To enable the Council to meet its statutory obligations under Section 17A of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulation 2012 (as amended) and to allow the Stradbroke Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to a local referendum.

**91 MCA/18/48 FUNDING FOR POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS**

- 91.1 Councillor Julie Flatman, Cabinet Member for Communities introduced Report MCA/18/48 and said the proposal for the Council to fund two PCSOs in the District was a response to concerns from the Town and Parish Council and the business community and would be supporting policing in the District.
- 91.2 Councillor Flatman MOVED recommendations 3.1 and 3.2, page 100 of the report which was seconded by Councillor Nick Gowley.
- 91.3 Councillor Otton supported the proposal but asked for reassurance that the PCSOs were used across the District and not just in Stowmarket. PCSOs should be called upon at major events in villages and be able to issue fixed penalties to offenders.
- 91.4 Members were reassured that PCSOs would be involved in the local

communities and at local events. They would be operating on a rota system to be present at different days at different places between 8.30 am to 6.00 pm. The proposal included the used of vehicles which would display some kind of recognition that the cars and the PCSOs were supported by the Council.

- 91.5 Councillor Gowrley said the PCSOs would be placed in Stowmarket and would be able to issues fixed penalties notices for offences such as car parking.
- 91.6 Councillor Stringer was concerned over the hours of working for the PCSOs and if flexi time was an option.
- 91.7 Councillor Welham asked if the PCSOs could deal with speeding issues in the communities and it was clarified that PCSOs would only be able to work with speeding offences up to 30 MPH.
- 91.8 Councillor Barker supported the PCSOs proposal as this would provide more police visibility in the community.
- 91.9 Regular reports would be provided to Cabinet.

By a unanimous vote

**It was RESOLVED:** -

- 1.1 To agree to fund two Police Community Support Officers for a period of 2 years at a total cost of £149,200 (including vehicles).**
- 1.2 To delegate to the Strategic Director, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities, the authority to agree the final terms of the Agreement between Mid Suffolk District Council and Suffolk Police**

#### **Reason for Decision**

To increase policing capacity in response to concerns from businesses and residents.

Cabinet adjourned for 15 minutes and the meeting was continued at 3:55pm.

#### **92 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC (WHICH TERM INCLUDES THE PRESS)**

**By a unanimous vote**

**It was RESOLVED:**

**That under section 100(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 3 of**

**Schedule 12A of the Act in the paragraph registered against the item:**

*Note: Information is exempt only if:*

*It falls within one of the 7 categories of exempt information in the Act and; In all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information*

**93 MCA/18/49 GATEWAY 14 POST ACQUISITION**

By 8 votes to 0

**It was RESOLVED:** -

**The recommendation as set out in report MCa/18/49 be approved.**

**Reason for Decision**

To enable the site to be managed and brought forward for development.

**94 MCA/18/50 MID SUFFOLK FORMER HQ SITE DEVELOPMENT**

By 9 votes to 0

**It was RESOLVED:** -

**That Recommendations as set out in Report MCa/18/58 be approved.**

**Reason for Decision**

To enable and support the delivery of housing within the district and support the economic prosperity of one of Mid Suffolk's key market towns.

The business of the meeting was concluded at 4:28pm.

.....  
Chair